Page 234 Page 235 1 B. Black B. Black 1 2 2 15th email. A. Yes. 3 3 Q. It says, "We don't know if they cut Q. Okay. So it's actually not from 4 EBITDA." 4 Jamie Kiggen. 5 5 A. No, but it presents Jamie Kiggen's And then it says, "JK is in Europe 6 6 but wants to talk next week about reducing our views. 7 Q. According to Catherine Watters. 7 numbers at some point before they report T1." 8 According to Catherine Watters. 8 Right? A. 9 9 Okay. You attach no significance to And I'm sorry, you interpret this to Ο. mean that Jamie Kiggen did not believe Credit 10 that? 10 11 MR. FOX: Objection. Suisse's numbers for AOL at this time period? 11 12 A. I have no reason to think that 12 MR. FOX: Objection. 13 Catherine wasn't accurately reporting Jamie's 13 A. Let me return to the phrasing of the 14 desire to talk about reducing his numbers. 14 expert report which is, "I was instructed to O. Okav. So let's go through it, parse make the following factual assumptions and they 15 15 16 through this email. 16 are consistent with the factual record available 17 to me." 17 It says, "MER cut its AOL revenue..." 18 Do you know what "MER" refers to? 18 So the March 15th email is consistent 19 A. No actually. 19 with the assumption that Jamie Kiggen as of this 20 Q. Is it possible it refers to Merrill 20 date did not believe that AOL would meet its 21 Lynch? 21 guidance or CSFB's public estimates. O. Okav. What about him wanting to talk 22 A. Yes. 22 O. "MER cut its AOL revenue from 40.7 to 23 23 about reducing numbers to you suggests that he \$40.1 billion..." 24 thought it was necessary to reduce those number Is that a \$600 million reduction? in order to meet AOL's likely reported numbers 25 Page 236 Page 237 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 for the next quarter? others around this same time period. 3 3 A. That feels like a confused question, Certainly the way that if you look at 4 so I want to ask you maybe to restate it. I'm 4 Laura Martin's response, certainly the way that 5 not sure I understand the question. 5 she interprets what he's saying. O. Okav. All it says is he wants to 6 6 Q. The way she's interprets what he's 7 7 talk "...about reducing our numbers." saving is what? 8 8 A. Yes. MR. FOX: Objection. 9 9 Q. It doesn't say that he wants to -- I A. So the first two sentences of her mean, you don't view that as he wants to talk 10 reply on March 29th, though again, I seem to 10 about whether we should reduce our numbers, you 11 11 recall there's some other stuff in between, you think it means that he wants to talk about the know, other emails, says, "This may be one that 12 13 need for us to reduce our numbers? Is that how vou and I disagree on. I would not lower 13 14 vou -- that's how you read it? 14 numbers on AOL even though they can't make 15 A. In context I consider this to be most 15 them." likely a statement that he believes that they 16 16 I take that to be her reading his 17 should reduce their numbers given what he then 17 message, plus whatever happened between the 15th thinks about AOL's performance. 18 and the 29th, as suggesting that he believes that the numbers should be lower. 19 Q. Where does that come from? 19 20 A. It comes partly from he's sending 20 And -this to Laura Martin and he already knows that 21 21 Q. Okay. So you think --22 22 Laura Martin wants to bring the numbers down, A. -- that's part of the context here. Q. Okay. And but what -- do you look at 23 she has since January. 23 what he said about this at his deposition? 24 And it's also part of what -- there's 24 25 this email thread, but then there are a bunch of 25 A. I read his deposition but I don't

Page 239 Page 238 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 2 recall his specific statements. A. That feels like a compound question. 3 Q. But there's no point in us looking at 3 So it is my view that it might well be that one should place greater weight on 4 it, because whatever it says, you're going to 4 5 5 say that he's biased and that he's just interpreting a document written in 2001 the way 6 providing color after the fact in the same way an outsider would read it. you discounted Laura Martin's views about what 7 To the extent that interpretation is 7 8 she's saying; is that right? 8 intentioned with a later statement of a 9 9 MR. FOX: Objection. deposition about what that might mean, I don't 10 10 A. I'm happy not to look at it. If take that to be a statement about any person in 11 that's your -- it's your -- you're asking the 11 particular, I take that to be a statement, a 12 questions. You can ask me to look at it, you 12 general statement. 13 can as ask me not to look at it. 13 And I think I would hold that general 14 Q. I'm just saying without looking at 14 view that I think there's value reading 15 it, I'm asking you are you going to make the 15 documents on their own. 16 same argument about what I show you that you 16 That isn't to say that there is no 17 17 made about Laura Martin; that eight years after value in seeing what people would then say about 18 the fact or five years after the fact people 18 them when asked. 19 19 have a tendency when they're defendants and Q. But I mean let's be honest, you think 20 20 whatever nonsense you were talking about before that your reading of Jamie Kiggen and Laura 21 about why Laura Martin's views are biased, are 21 Martin's emails at the time and what they meant 22 you going to make that same argument about Jamie 22 is actually better than their own deposition Kiggen's views about his emails such that testimony about their emails because they suffer 23 24 there's no point in me showing it to you? from some bias that you don't suffer from? 25 MR. FOX: Objection. Isn't that exactly what -- in substance, isn't Page 240 Page 241 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 that what you said about Laura Martin's views 2 assumptions are consistent with the factual 3 3 about the January 11th email? record available to me. 4 A. No. I think that my view is informed 4 Q. Okay. Your testimony has been 5 by what she said at her deposition, which is not 5 rejected in the past on the basis -- your expert the same thing as saying I give dispositive 6 6 testimony has been rejected in the past on the 7 weight to what she said at her deposition when 7 basis that a judge in at least one opinion 8 other interpretations are possible. 8 thought that you were providing what was 9 But again, this is an assumption that 9 essentially legal testimony; is that right? 10 I was asked to make and all I'm saying in my 10 A. I think I know what you're referring 11 report the factual record is consistent with 11 to, but I think if you phrase that generally, I 12 that assumption. 12 wouldn't say that was entirely right. 13 It's possible for the trier of fact 13 Q. What do you think I'm referring to? 14 to read the factual record in a manner that's 14 A. You're probably referring to a 15 consistent with this assumption. 15 statement in a case involving ONBANCorp in the 16 Q. That sounds like a legal mid-1990s where I submitted an expert report 16 17 interpretation. that I think was mostly in the nature of factual 17 18 I mean are you now opining on whether 18 material and had a bit of what I would consider 19 the summary judgment standard has been met with 19 a legal analysis at the end, and the judge 20 respect to this issue? 20 didn't like the legal analysis. A. I was not trying to express a legal 21 21 O. Okav. 22 opinion. 22 A. But I don't think it was a fair 23 23 O. No. description of my report as a whole. 24 A. I was just trying to say what I Q. That's not what I'm talking about, 24 thought it meant to me to say that these 25 but in that case Judge Pooler did indicate that

Case 1:02-cv-12146-NG Page 3 of 30 Page 242 Page 243 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 2 is consistent with a factual record available to she was inclined to grant the motion to strike 3 3 your testimony because it consisted largely of me and I don't mean to say this is the only legal argument; is that correct? 4 4 possible interpretation of the factual record. 5 5 Q. Why would Kiggen issue reports on AOL A. She said something like if a motion 6 had been made, I might have been inclined to 6 that he didn't believe? 7 7 grant it, but it wasn't made and probably it MR. FOX: Objection. 8 wasn't made because except for this one section 8 A. I can offer a number of reasons. 9 9 of my report, it wouldn't have been appropriate O. Okav. 10 10 to make it. A. One reason would be a desire to 11 O. In fact it was made and withdrawn 11 preserve the potential for investment banking business for CSFB with AOL. 12 actually. 12 Q. Let's stop with that. We'll continue 13 A. That I have no knowledge about. 13 14 Q. Actually I was talking about the 14 on. Let's take them one at time. Alumex, Inc. versus IRS case. Do you know what CSFB's investment 15 15 A. Alumex? 16 banking relationship was with AOL? 16 17 17 Q. Alumex, yeah. A. No. 18 A. I don't recall my opinion in Alumex 18 Do you know if Jamie Kiggen received О. as having been rejected as legal in nature. 19 19 compensation based on investment banking Q. Okay. I'm not going to waste time on 20 business generated by the investment banking 20 21 it. 21 division of CSFB? 22 22 MR. FOX: Objection. A. But in any event, I was not trying to provide a legal statement. I was just trying to 23 A. I believe there was testimony in his 2.3 provide -- you know, let me limit what it is I 24 deposition that that was not an explicit part of 25 his compensation. mean when I say, you know, that, you know, this Page 244 Page 245 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 writing something, so he might have been Q. Do you believe there was testimony 3 3 concerned with maintaining his access to the suggesting that it was an implicit part of his 4 compensation? 4 company executives, including Richard Hanlon and 5 MR. FOX: Objection. 5 Robert Pittman. б 6 A. There's certainly information in the Q. Okay. Anything else? 7 7 record suggesting that he was sensitive to the A. He may have been concerned with --8 possibility of investment banking business. let's put it in general, analysts who work for 9 Q. Okay. Irrespective of his 9 investment banks are called sell side analysts 10 compensation or in light of his compensation? 10 and they're called that for a reason; that in 11 A. I guess I want to say there is 11 some sense although their compensation doesn't 12 testimony that he was sensitive to that 12 directly come from trading commissions, it's possibility, and I'm not aware of it being an 13 certainly indirectly related to trading 14 explicit part of his compensation and, you know, 14 commissions, and on the whole you don't get 15 what went into long run compensation decisions 15 people to trade by telling them they shouldn't and what went into CSFB's decision to hire him buy. So there's probably some reason that is 16 16 17 at salary X instead of Y, I don't know. 17 compensation related for analysts to be, sell 18 Q. Okay. And -- all right. What were 18 side analysts to be systematically upward 19 some other reasons why he would have a 19 biased. 20 motivation to lie in his research reports? 20 Q. Anything else?

A. Fourth, Jamie Kiggen had been a 2.1 22 longtime bull on AOL and I believe into late 2000 had a price target on the order of 115 or

23

120 if I recall correctly, and so he had just 24 25 brought it down from that very high level to 80

A. I think that analysts are concerned

to be reduced or even withdrawn entirely if an

about maintaining access to company executives and there's certainly the potential for access

analyst makes the company executives unhappy by

2.1

22

24

Page 247 Page 246 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 2 in December of 2000 or January 2001 I believe. determine whether his research reports and the 3 He might have felt that it would be 3 numbers that he put forward were consistent 4 with, were consistent with -- as between -- I'm 4 embarrassing and harmful to his reputation to 5 sorry. Strike that. 5 then bring it down further, and again, given 6 Did you look to see if whether any of 6 where it had been so recently and therefore 7 7 might have wanted to stretch out the period over the analysts who were covering AOL who did not 8 which he revised downward his views on AOL. 8 have the motivations to lie that you indicate 9 9 Q. And more harmful to his reputation that Mr. Kiggen had, had similar metrics for AOL than being wrong in your view. during the time period of 2001 and 2002? 10 10 11 A. That's certainly, certainly possible 11 MR. FOX: Objection. that he would have perceived more harm to his 12 12 A. Let me respond by saying that with 13 reputation from two collectively large downward 13 regard to the first three causes of concern, 14 revisions in short order than from stretching 14 concern for investment banking business, concern 15 15 for access to company executives and concern out --16 O. Even if that made him more accurate. 16 with generating trading revenue, that I would 17 MR. FOX: Objection. 17 consider those to probably apply across the 18 A. Even if the hypothetical second 18 board to many analysts and not be specific to downward revision would have been closer to the 19 19 Jamie Kiggen. sum of his views on AOL and Laura Martin's views 20 And I have not researched the extent 20 21 on Time Warner. America Online and Laura 21 to which the fourth concern, which is my estimate used to be even higher than it is 22 Martin's views on Time Warner. 22 23 23 Q. Did you look at any of the research today, would apply to analysts other than Jamie 24 analysts who covered AOL who did not have the 24 Kiggen. same motivations that Kiggen might have to 25 25 Q. Do you know what Bernstein Research Page 248 Page 249 B. Black 1 B. Black 1 2 is? 2 A. It might be relevant. 3 3 Q. But you didn't do that. A. I've heard the name. 4 4 A. I did not systematically look at Q. Do you know if they covered AOL 5 during the class period? 5 other analysts as part of this assignment. You indicate that, in your report, 6 A. I believe that they did. 6 7 7 Q. Do you know if they have investment that Kiggen didn't believe that AOL would meet 8 8 banking business? its numbers because of the March 15th email. 9 9 A. I've not heard of them as an Do you know when the next report that 10 was issued by Credit Suisse that had actual 10 investment banking firm. Q. That's because they don't do 11 11 numbers in it was? 12 investment banking business. 12 In terms of numbers, I'm talking So the bias that you indicated with about revenue and EBITDA numbers. 13 13 14 respect to generating investment banking 14 MR. FOX: Objection. 15 business, that wouldn't apply to Bernstein; is 15 A. I'm aware that there was a major report issued on April 10th, but I'm not aware 16 that right? 16 17 A. If they don't have investment banking 17 of whether there were smaller reports between 18 business, then it wouldn't apply. 18 March 15th and April 10th. 19 O. Okav. So do vou think it would be a 19 O. So let's take a look at that report. useful metric to determine whether or not 20 MR. GESSER: This is Black-15. 20 21 Mr. Kiggen's reports were reasonable to take a 21 (Defendants' Exhibit Black 15, Credit look at someone like Bernstein who didn't have 22 Suisse First Boston report dated 4/10/01, investment banking business to see what their 23 marked for identification, as of this

24

25

date.)

BY MR. GESSER:

24 numbers were to see if they were comparable?

MR. FOX: Objection.

25

Page 251 Page 250 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 O. So turning to page 29 --2 specific date. 3 3 Q. Okay. Right. That's a \$400 million MR. FOX: I would just say this is a 4 long report and do you want to give the 4 reduction in the revenue numbers? 5 5 witness time to look at it? A. If my recollection is correct, then 6 6 that would be a \$400 million reduction in MR. GESSER: I would hope the witness 7 7 has looked at it. It's all over his projected revenue. 8 report. 8 Q. So Kiggen actually does bring down 9 9 MR. FOX: Well, I understand, but it the revenue number, right, as he said he would 10 might be a while since he's looked at it. 10 in the email; is that right? 11 MR. GESSER: Okay. Well, your -- I'm 11 MR. FOX: Objection. 12 12 BY MR. GESSER: going to --Q. In the March 15th email? 13 MR. FOX: Whatever you want. 13 14 A. I've turned to page 29. 14 A. Assuming that the most recent prior 15 Q. Okay. What's the net revenue number 15 revenue number was \$41.6 billion, 41.2 was lower that's there? 16 16 than 41.6. 17 A. The net revenue after intersegment 17 Q. Okay. So -elimination for the full year 2001 is 41,184 in 18 It appears that the -- that there was 18 19 millions of dollars. 19 not a change in the EBITDA number because I'm 20 20 Q. So does that mean that Kiggen seeing approximately \$10.9 billion here and my actually reduced the net revenue number? 21 21 recollection is that there were similar prior 22 MR. FOX: Objection. 22 numbers. 2.3 A. My recollection is that the -- that 23 Q. Do you know what AOL's guidance was there was an earlier CSFB number of \$41.6 24 at this time? billion. I'm not pinning that down to a 25 A. AOL's guidance was \$11 billion. Page 252 Page 253 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 Q. Okay. So he was below guidance. 2 revenue number; is that right? 3 3 A. He was below guidance, but explicitly MR. FOX: Asked and answered. ruling out the EBITDA or revenue impact of a AOL 4 A. Again, not having in front of me the 4 5 subscription price rise. 5 immediate prior reports, I have a recollection 6 6 Q. Where does that come from? of \$41.6 billion at some prior date. A. In some of his reports, and I forget 7 7 Q. Okay. So now what is it about the which ones, he explicitly says, "We're not 8 email that is now inconsistent -- the March 15th 9 9 building this into our analysis" and in fact email is now inconsistent with his report? 10 that's a lever that AOL has to try to meet 10 MR. FOX: Objection. 11 guidance if they need it, where I think there's 11 A. First, I don't want to look just at 12 lots of indication that a subscription price 12 the March 15th email. I also want to look at rise was expected and indeed occurred relatively the back and forth between the 15th and the 13 13 14 soon thereafter. 14 29th. I want to look at whatever happened that isn't recorded in emails that may have informed 15 Q. Okay. To the extent that you say 15 16 that in your assumption at three that he said 16 Laura Martin's response, because she's clearly that AOL couldn't meet its EBITDA guidance, he's 17 talking about whether they should lower the 18 got an actually a lower EBITDA number than AOL 18 EBITDA estimate and that makes me think that 19 19 that was part of what Jamie Kiggen was correct? 20 A. I read this report as projecting that 20 interested in doing, even though the March 15th without a subscription price rise, AOL would not email is not explicit about that. 21 21 22 quite meet its EBITDA number, but in some sense Q. On the top of page 11 you say that he -- that "Kiggen increased estimated..." this 23 holding that in reserve in the same way that the 23 is on page 11, I'm sorry, of your report, that, 24 company is holding that in reserve. 24 25 Q. And he does actually lower the ''Kiggen increased estimated Time Warner revenue

Page 255 Page 254 B. Black 1 B. Black 1 2 2 by \$800 million so that overall AOL Time Warner A. For Time Warner only, no, I don't. 3 revenue dropped by \$400 million"; is that 3 Q. Okay. Would it surprise you to learn 4 that even with the increase by \$800 million, 4 5 5 that Time Warner beat the number that Kiggen had A. Which page of my report? 6 6 assigned to his Time Warner numbers for the Q. Top of 11. 7 (Document review.) 7 first quarter of 2001? 8 Yes. 8 A. So the question is, what were the A. Q. And you say, "It's hard to see how 9 Time -- what was the Time Warner estimated 9 this change in Time Warner revenue was either revenue for the first quarter of 2001, right and 10 10 honest or reasonable. Laura Martin was the Time 11 what was their actual revenue. 11 12 12 Warner expert. She was trying to bring the Time And gee, let's look at the numbers. 13 Warner numbers down, not up." 13 Q. I'm asking you -- we don't have time 14 Is that right? 14 because I've got other things, but I'm asking 15 A. Yes. you, would it surprise you to learn that CSFB's 15 16 Q. Did you actually bother to check 16 numbers, even with the \$800 million that you're whether or not with the \$800 million increase in talking about, actually fell short of the actual 17 17 Time Warner revenue, whether that was consistent 18 numbers that Time Warner reported for first 18 with what the actual numbers that Time Warner 19 quarter of 2001? 19 20 20 reported? So he was -- it was neither -- it was 21 MR. FOX: Objection. 21 not reasonable, but it was actually reasonably (Document review.) too low. He should have increased it more. 22 22 23 A. I believe that I did. 23 That would surprise you? 24 Q. Okay. So do you remember what the 24 That is not my recollection. 25 25 Okay. If we have time, I'm going to result was? Page 257 Page 256 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 show you those numbers, but I want to move on to this case? 2 3 3 another topic. A. Yes. 4 You indicate in your report that --4 Did you read her deposition 0. 5 let's look at page 15. That "On July 10th, a 5 transcript? 6 credible source in AOL's business affairs unit 6 A. No. 7 generated -- which generated the lion's share of 7 0. Do you know how old she was at the AOL's crucial ad com revenue advised CSFB of 8 time? 9 medium severity layoffs in that unit which would 9 A. not be publicly announced." 10 10 Do you know what level employee she Ο. was at the time? 11 Do you see that? 11 12 A. Yes. 12 O. What's your basis for saying that 13 13 Q. Do you know what she said about 14 source was credible? 14 whether she would have access to non-public 15 A. I have no reason to think otherwise. 15 information? Q. Okay. But did someone tell you it 16 16 A. I have --17 was a credible source? 17 MR. FOX: Objection. 18 A. I think I recall some back and --18 A. Well, if she said there were going to be medium severity layoffs which would not be some email, some emails in which sort of that 19 19 question was asked of this person at CSFB who publicly disclosed, that certainly suggests that 20 20 received the information of is your resource 21 21 she has access to non-public information. 22 credible and he answered yes. 22 Q. Is that my question? 23 O. Do you know who the source was? 23 We have very limited time, so why 24 don't you just answer my question? A. No. 24 25 Q. Do you know that she was deposed in 25 Do you know what she said at her

Page 259 Page 258 **B.** Black 1 1 B. Black 2 2 deposition about --Q. Okay. And so in this case, what do 3 you think Mr. Kiggen should have done with the A. I've already said I didn't read her rumor that he heard? 4 deposition. 5 5 MR. FOX: Objection. Q. But that's not what I'm asking. I'm saying did someone tell you what 6 A. What... 6 she said in her deposition about this. 7 7 MR. GESSER: I'm marking as Black --8 A. I have no knowledge about what she 8 (Defendants' Exhibit Black 16, Email said in her deposition at that level of 9 dated 1/11/01 from Lorenzo to Kiggen, 9 10 Watters, marked for identification, as of 10 specificity. O. Fine. 11 this date.) 11 12 So analysts hear rumors all the time, 12 A. Assuming that this is coming from a 13 correct? 13 credible source and that it is potentially 14 MR. FOX: Objection. 14 important information, the natural thing for him --15 A. I would expect that analysts are 15 likely to hear rumors with some frequency. 16 Q. I'm sorry. I'm going to stop you 16 Q. And they don't publish all the rumors there. 17 17 that they hear; is that right? 18 MR. GESSER: Are you going to insist 18 A. I would agree with that. 19 19 on the seven hours? Q. In fact it would be improper for them 20 20 MR. FOX: Yes. 21 to report many of the rumors that they hear. 21 MR. GESSER: Are you going to stop MR. FOX: Objection. 22 22 this at seven hours? 23 MR. FOX: Yes. 23 A. Depending on the rumor, it might be improper to report the rumor. It would depend 24 MR. GESSER: Okay. I'm going to move on the nature of the rumor. 25 to extend the time and ask him to come back Page 260 Page 261 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 unless you give me another half an hour. forth, I think it would be appropriate to see if 3 MR. FOX: I'm not agreeing to that. the company's investor relation person, 4 MR. GESSER: Okay. Then all right --4 Mr. Hanlon, would be willing to either confirm 5 MR. FOX: You can make whatever 5 or deny the existence of layoffs. 6 Q. Assuming he would not. 6 motion you want. 7 MR. GESSER: Fine. Then I'm going to 7 A. Well, he could do three things; he 8 ask you to just not make any more 8 could say yes, he could say no, or he could say 9 objections other than just objection for 9 we don't disclose that information. I don't know whether that inquiry was 10 the next 15, 20 minutes. 10 MR. FOX: Okay. Fine. made and I don't know what the response was, so 11 11 12 BY MR. GESSER: 12 it's going to become a complicated hypothetical Q. All right. I'm sorry, go ahead, you very quickly. 13 13 Q. But not knowing that, how are you 14 can continue answering the question. 14 able to opine on whether there was information 15 A. Assuming that he treats this, you 15 know, the rumor as credible and worthy of that was withheld from the market based on this 16 16 17 investigation, the natural place to go would be 17 email? 18 to AOL to see whether they're willing to confirm 18 MR. FOX: Objection. A. I don't know that I offered that or deny this information. 19 19 Q. Okay. You're an analyst, you receive 20 opinion. 20 this email that's in front of you that's marked 21 21 I offered an opinion that substantial Black-16, what do you think that analyst should 22 layoffs would be highly value relevant. do with that information? 23 Q. So you have no opinion as to whether 23 MR. FOX: Objection. 24 Kiggen should have disclosed this or not in his 24 25 A. That as part of the overall back and 25 report?

1

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

5

6

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Page 262 Page 263

B. Black

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

A. I think my sense would be that information about medium severity layoffs in a core business unit that's at the core of the value of AOL and the growth of AOL probably should prompt an inquiry at the company.

And I recall from his deposition that there was some back and forth on whether that inquiry had occurred; that he wasn't, if you will, disagreeing that he ought to inquire further and his view, without having specific recollection, is oh, we must have and there must have been nothing to it or something along those 14 lines. That's not a precise recollection.

So I think his view was that yes, it was appropriate to investigate further and they must have done so and not found any substance to it, and therefore said nothing.

19 That may not be a fair paraphrase of 20 his deposition testimony, but that's what I 21 recall.

22 Q. Do you even know what my question 2.3 was?

24 I've now forgotten it. A.

My question was would vou have

B. Black

disclosed this as an analyst?

- 3 A. I'd want more information. So you don't say hey, we have a source within AOL that 5 says X, you go ask the company, you see if you 6 can verify. 7
 - Q. And you just said that Kiggen thinks that that must have happened and that they didn't learn anything more than this.

MR. FOX: Objection.

Q. Assuming that to be true, assuming that Kiggen did some kind of analysis and couldn't learn anything more than this.

MR. FOX: Objection.

So again, let me try to pin down the hypothetical. So Kiggen talks to him and says, you know, we've been told that there are significant or medium severity or something layoffs in business affairs and, you know, I'm worried about what that implies for ad com revenues because these are people who are generating the ads and Hanlon says, "False."

Q. No. That's not what I'm saying. Hanlon says, "Greg FD says that I can't provide non-public information to analysts so I'm not

Page 264

Page 265

B. Black

telling you."

A. That's a tough one. You've got potentially I think highly value relevant information that is not yet fully confirmed but it's also not denied either, and the appropriate course might be to see if you could confirm it in some other way.

Q. Assume you couldn't.

A. I have not formed an opinion and I'm sort of reluctant to do so on the fly. 11

Q. What do you think about this email suggests -- let's take the layoffs, for example, let's take the layoffs and separate them from the accounting investigation.

What about this email makes you think that this is highly relevant information to the

A. If AOL is saying publicly we don't see the effect of the online advertising 21 slowdown on us, we're doing just fine, we're growing rapidly, and at the same time they're 23 laying off people in their advertising division, 24 those are inconsistent.

Q. How many employees does AOL have at 25

B. Black

2 this time?

3 A. 15,000 at a rough estimate, but I 4 don't -- don't hold me to that.

Q. Okay. How about 90,000 for the Time Warner, AOL combined Time Warner?

7 A. Oh, I'm sorry. I was thinking 8 America Online. I think America Online would 9 have been about 15,000.

10 I don't even have a view on what Time 11 Warner's overall would have been.

We're getting tangled up in the terminology again.

Q. That's why I said...

And a layoff that's medium in terms of severity, what do you take that to mean?

A. So out of a denominator of 15,000, certainly well into the hundreds, 500. More than 500, not 5,000.

Q. And why are you using the denominator of 15,000 instead of 90,000?

22 A. Because I take this information to be 23 information about the America Online unit and not about AOL TW as a whole. 24

Q. Why do you do that?

Page 266 Page 267 1 1 B. Black B. Black 2 2 A. That's my recollection of the facts view as to what he meant when he wrote "medium of the case. I believe the source was someone 3 severity"? 3 4 4 A. I am not familiar with the contents in the business affairs unit and that's my --5 of his deposition. 5 there are other emails related to that but, you 6 6 know, it's a view on the facts, but that is my My recollection is that he didn't 7 7 view of the facts and it's not just coming just have any more information other than the term 8 from this email. 8 "medium severity." 9 9 Q. How do you recall that if you didn't Q. And medium, is that a term of art, review his deposition transcript? medium layoffs or you're just ascribing some 10 10 11 number to that? 11 A. From conversations with counsel. 12 12 A. I'm ascribing some general value of MR. FOX: I would just caution the 13 look, it's not, you know, it's not huge, right? 13 witness not to get into conversations with 14 But it's significant I suppose in some way. 14 I can't go behind the words "medium 15 15 THE WITNESS: Okay. 16 severity." So you asked me in some sense to 16 BY MR. GESSER: 17 speculate about out of 15,000 people, how many 17 Q. You said that one thing you'd want to would be medium severity and my speculation was, 18 do is try to verify this through other sources, 18 you know, well into the hundreds. 19 through AOL and so forth; is that correct? 19 20 A. Yes. 20 Q. Who's the author of this email? 21 A. Anthony Lorenzo. 21 Q. Just to save time, I'm going to show Q. Do you know if Anthony Lorenzo was you something that's been previously marked as 22 22 deposed in this case? 23 23 Lorenzo 6 so we don't have to waste the time 24 A. I understand that he was. 24 re-exhibiting it. 25 O. Do you know if Anthony Lorenzo gave a 25 Have you seen this before? Page 268 Page 269 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 A. Yes, I have. 2 Online." 3 Q. It's a Washington Post article from 3 A. Yes. 4 July 11, 2001? 4 Q. Okay. If you were Jamie Kiggen and 5 A. Yes. 5 had seen this article on the same day that you 6 Q. If you take a look at the email, if 6 had received this email, any reason to think 7 you take a look at the email, that's July 11; is 7 that these layoffs are not the layoffs referred 8 that right, from Anthony Lorenzo? to in the email? 9 A. The email from Anthony Lorenzo is 9 A. I think that the view that these were 10 July 11th. 10 the same layoffs and the view that these were 11 Q. And the article is from July 11th as 11 not the same layoffs are both consistent with 12 well; is that right? 12 the factual evidence available to me. Q. What was my question? A. That's correct. 13 13 14 Q. And the article talks about layoffs 14 A. You asked me whether Kiggen should 15 that occurred yesterday, so that would have been 15 have assumed that these were the same layoffs. on July 10th; is that right? Q. Was it reasonable for Kiggen to 16 16 17 A. That's correct. 17 assume they were the same layoffs? 18 Q. It says, "In -- AOL Time Warner 18 MR. FOX: Objection. yesterday laid off 30 people in its online A. Again, I think the natural and 19 19 marketing division," okay? appropriate thing for him to do, and I think the 20 20 2.1 A. Yes. 21 thing he says he assumed he did, was to check 22 Q. And then it says in the next 22 with the company. paragraph, "These are employees who worked in 23 23 And then I'd want to know, okay, what the business development group in the 24 did the company say about that. 24 25 interactive marketing division of America 25 And one of the things the company

Page 271 Page 270 1 B. Black B. Black 1 2 2 might have said is go read the Washington Post. do so. 3 And if the company said something 3 I'm certainly not saying no, my 4 4 other than that, that might be evidence opinion is that hypothetical course of conduct 5 5 suggesting that this was something different would be unreasonable. 6 6 than what was reported in the Washington Post. O. What leads you to even think that it 7 7 So without getting into fairly could be unreasonable? 8 complicated hypotheticals. 8 MR. FOX: Objection. 9 9 Q. Let's say assume he did not talk to A. Thirty people doesn't sound like medium severity to me, so at least it would 10 the company at all, but instead saw this and 10 11 then looked at the Washington Post and said occur to me that these aren't the same thing. 11 12 okay, well, layoffs, layoffs same day, same 12 And if he's in regular conversation 13 division, same everything, that must be it. And 13 with Hanlon, which he probably is, it might well this is not being announced by the company, this 14 have been appropriate for him to do what he says is somehow being leaked. I think that this must 15 in deposition he thinks he did, which is ask. 15 be the same layoffs. No need for me to report 16 O. So it may be unreasonable because 30 16 17 17 on it, it's already public. layoffs doesn't sound like medium severity. 18 MR. FOX: Objection. 18 Is it possible that the source didn't 19 BY MR. GESSER: 19 know the scope of the layoffs, all she knew was 20 20 that people in her division were laid off and O. Reasonable? 21 MR. FOX: Objection. 21 she described it as medium, but what her view is A. I guess I certainly didn't -- I 22 22 medium and what your view is medium are quite wasn't trying to form an opinion on the 23 different? 23 reasonableness of this particular hypothetical 24 A. I would consider it to be possible 25 25 course of conduct and I find myself reluctant to that either she didn't know the scope of the Page 272 Page 273 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 layoffs or that the layoffs that were announced 2 Q. If you look at page 16 of your 3 3 in the Washington Post were layoffs that she report. 4 would have considered to be of medium severity. 4 (Document review.) 5 Q. You said that you thought that both 5 Okay. 6 hypotheticals or both possible factual 6 Q. You say, "On August 13th, the Wall 7 situations were plausible, I believe, or I don't 7 Street Journal reported significant expected know if you said equally plausible, but both 8 layoffs at AOL consistent with the information plausible; one, that the layoffs that occurred 9 available to CSFB about layoffs at AOL's on -- that were announced in the Washington Post business affairs unit." 10 10 11 article are the layoffs that are being referred 11 A. Yes. 12 to in the Lorenzo email from January 11, and 12 Q. If it's not explicitly said, the 13 also that they were not; is that right? strong suggestion is there that you're talking 13 14 MR. FOX: Objection. 14 about that the layoffs that are referred to in 15 A. I think I said that it struck me that 15 the Lorenzo email from July 11th are the same 16 those were both plausible assumptions or layoffs on August 13th. 16 17 reasonable assumptions or something like that. 17 A. Well, I assume that in Footnote 2. 18 Q. And then I think just from your 18 Q. Okay. So I'm asking --19 report, I think you would say, if I'm correct, By the time I get to page 16, I've 19 that in the alternative possibility, the layoffs 20 20 already assumed that. that are being referred to in the July 11th 21 21 Q. Okay. But before you said not only 22 email are actually layoffs that occurred, were 22 have you assumed it, but you view it to be a announced publicly on July 13th; is that right? 23 plausible conclusion: is that right? 23 A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat the 24 24 Yes. I think I would not have been 25 question? 25 comfortable assuming -- making the assumption in

Page 274 Page 275 1 1 B. Black B. Black 2 2 Footnote 2 if I didn't think it was a reasonable the assumption I'm making in Footnote 2. 3 3 assumption. Q. Do you know how many people were laid 4 4 off on August -- were announced that were going Q. Okay. So those layoffs, the layoffs that are announced on August 13th, do you know 5 5 to be laid off in the August 13th, August 14th if they were public at any time before August 6 6 Wall Street Journal and then subsequently I 7 7 13th? think it's the Washington Post articles? 8 A. My understanding is that those 8 A. About 1,000 people overall. 9 9 Q. And do you know where those people layoffs were not publicly disclosed prior to The Wall Street Journal article on the 13th. were to be laid off? 10 10 11 Q. So that would mean that the source at 11 MR. FOX: Objection. A. I think, if I'm recalling The Wall 12 AOL, according to let's say the second factual 12 13 scenario that you say is plausible, would have 13 Street Journal article correctly, I'm not had non-public information about layoffs on July 14 recalling great specificity about which business 15 10th, 2001 that were not made public until 15 units. 16 August 13th, 2001, so roughly a month that the 16 O. Physically do you know where? source would know about layoffs at AOL that had 17 17 A. I'm recalling a reference to D.C., 18 not been announced publicly; is that correct? 18 but the article speaks for itself. 19 A. Well, they weren't announced publicly 19 Some in D.C., some in California. Does that sound familiar? 20 on August 13th either. The Wall Street Journal 20 21 reported on them. 21 A. I recall D.C. Q. Okay. But that were unknown to the 22 22 I'm not recalling more detail than market until August 13th. 23 23 that. 24 MR. FOX: Objection. 24 Were layoffs expected post merger? Yes, that would be consistent with 25 25 MR. FOX: Objection. Page 276 Page 277 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 A. Some layoffs at the combined company 2 Q. Where does it say in that email that 3 3 were expected post merger. the person is in the business affairs unit? 4 Q. And in fact one of the reasons for 4 A. I believe that that's the case and 5 people being optimistic about the combined 5 I'm not -- is there a July 10th email? 6 Q. Yes. It's Lorenzo-3. 6 entity was the fact that there would be certain 7 7 synergies between the companies that would lead (Document review.) 8 to a reduction in workforce; is that correct? 8 A. Okay. So Lorenzo-3 does not indicate 9 in what office the source worked and I'm not 9 A. Yes. 10 10 recalling now where my belief that she worked in O. Okav. So why did these lavoffs that the business affairs unit came from, but I still 11 are announced -- why do these layoffs that are 11 12 referred to in the July 11th email, why do you 12 believe that to be the case. view them as being necessarily negative? O. It's not the case, but that's fine. 13 13 14 MR. FOX: Objection. 14 You don't know where your belief came from. You 15 A. They would be likely to be negative 15 don't know where your belief came from, but I'm both because they were concentrated within AOL actually going to represent to you that that's 16 16 17 and because at least in July 11th they were 17 not the case. 18 concentrated in business affairs, which is where 18 A. Okav. 19 19 the ad commerce revenue is coming from. Does that change your view in any 20 So I wouldn't be nearly as troubled 20 way? 21 by hey, we figured out to provide modems using 21 MR. FOX: Objection. 22 A. To the extent that the layoffs were 22 fewer people and therefore we're going to cut concentrated in the business affairs unit, which 23 our -- the number of people who provide modem 23 24 was my understanding, that would be more service. I wouldn't doubt that they're still 24

25 providing modems.

concerning than layoffs elsewhere within America

Case 1:02-cv-12146-NG Page 12 of 30 Page 279 Page 278 B. Black 1 1 B. Black 2 Online. 2 MR. FOX: Objection. 3 3 Q. And in order for your -- the second A. What I find myself thinking about is 4 hypothetical to be true, that the source of AOL 4 that it's quite likely in July, from Lorenzo-3 5 was referring to layoffs that actually were and Lorenzo-6, that Ms. Bernard did not have a announced publicly by the Washington -- I'm 6 huge amount of specific detail about numbers and 7 sorry, The Wall Street Journal on August 13th, 7 locations and so on. She had general that would mean that this source would need to 8 information and, you know, either didn't have 9 have non-public information about 1,000 people more specific information or didn't disclose it 10 being laid off at various -- at AOL. 10 to Mr. Lorenzo. 11 Would it matter to you whether that 11 I wouldn't expect a junior person to 12 source was in a position to know such 12 have highly specific information but would think 13 information? 13 it at least plausible that she might have 14 MR. FOX: Objection. 14 general information. 15 A. It's certainly my -- I don't have 15 Q. About what? 16 that information. 16 A. About impending future layoffs which 17 Q. But if I represent to you that the 17 might not have been at that time definite as to 18 source of AOL was a woman named Sarah Bernard 18 number of people and location. 19 who was a 25-year-old, very junior employee at 19 Q. Non-public information, she might 20 AOL, would that affect your view as to whether 20 have non-public information that would stay 21 or not it was more likely that the layoffs she 21 non-public for a month. 22 was referring to were the ones that were 22 MR. FOX: Objection. announced on July 11th in the Washington Post 23 That doesn't seem to me to be 24 article or the layoffs that were announced implausible if the layoffs did not occur 25 August 13th in The Wall Street Journal article? immediately, but instead mostly occurred some Page 280 Page 281 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 weeks later. evidence that are consistent with one view and 3 Q. Okay. Take a look at the email at 3 it's possible that there are other pieces of 4 the bottom of Lorenzo-3. 4 evidence that are consistent with a different 5 It says, "I have source at AOL and 5 view, so I'm reluctant to form a strong opinion. 6 apparently the company had some layoffs today." 6 Again, I didn't view it as my job to 7 7 form an opinion on what this information A. Okay. 8 Q. Does that change your view as to 8 referred to. whether the source at AOL is likely talking 9 I've viewed it as my job to say if it about layoffs that were announced on August 13th 10 10 referred to the layoffs that were announced in 11 or more likely talking about layoffs that were 11 August, that would be important information. 12 announced in the Washington Post article of July 12 Q. I'm not asking you if there's other 13 11th? 13 things out there that could make one believe if 14 14 they existed, that the layoffs were the August A. I would agree that this would move 15 you in the direction of that the email is 15 13th. 16 referring to layoffs that took place on July 16 I'm asking you based on everything 17 10th. 17 you've got in front of you and everything you've seen, what makes you still think that it is

18 Q. Having been through this back and 19 forth, what in your mind still makes you think 20 there's any possibility that the layoffs 21 referred to in the string of emails are actually 22 the layoffs that occurred on -- that were

announced on August 13th? A. I suppose that sitting in a

deposition and you're giving me pieces of

23

24

 Medium severity doesn't sound to me like 30 people in a company as big as AOL.

plausible that the layoffs that are referred to

in Lorenzo-3 and 6 are the layoffs that were

announced by the Wall Street Journal on August

25 Ο. Anything else?

19 20

21

22

23

24

13th?

Page 282 Page 283 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 2 A. In terms of what's been put before me within the business affairs unit. Assuming that this information exceeded what was publicly 3 in the last 30 minutes, that's I think the 4 known concerning AOL's dealings with Purchase principal thing I would look to. 4 Pro, this knowledge could be important to 5 Q. Now turning to the second part of the 5 email, Lorenzo-6, there is a reference to an 6 investors." 6 7 7 investigation? Did you do any analysis on your own 8 MR. FOX: Lorenzo-6? 8 to determine whether or not the information that 9 9 was contained in this email exceeded what was MR. GESSER: I'm sorry. I apologize. 10 publicly known concerning AOL's dealings with It's Black-16. 10 11 11 **Purchase Pro?** A. Yes. 12 12 MR. FOX: Black-16. Got it. A. No. 13 BY MR. GESSER: 13 MR. FOX: Objection. 14 Q. "In addition, I wasn't aware that AOL 14 BY MR. GESSER: Q. So you have no view as to whether or 15 was under investigation and has suspended some 15 16 employees for inappropriate accounting 16 not the information contained in this email activities. Some deals booked inappropriately, 17 17 exceeds what was known about AOL's dealings with inflated revenue. Also some employees have been 18 Purchase Pro at this time? 19 accused of trading irregularities; namely A. I was treating that as an assumption 20 shorting some partner stocks." rather than a matter on which I had the ability 20 21 A. I see that. 21 to factually investigate. Q. But did you in fact look at documents 22 Q. You say on page 7 of your report at 22 that led you to believe one way or the other 23 the top, "Also in July 2001, CSFB became aware 23 through the same source of an internal 24 whether that was an assumption that was valid or investigation into accounting irregularity 25 plausible, or did you just treat that as an 25 Page 284 Page 285 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 assumption that -- without any, forming any of 2 the first quarter of 2001 and it looks like we 3 vour own view as to whether that assumption was 3 do have time. 4 4 valid or not? MR. GESSER: So I'm going to mark 5 A. I did not try to form my own view 5 as -- what do we have here? whether that assumption was valid. 6 6 So I think we already have marked the 7 Q. Whether you tried or not, did you? 7 April 10th, 2001 report as Black -- someone 8 A. I did not form the opinion that the 8 help me. 9 9 assumption was unreasonable or I wouldn't have THE WITNESS: Fifteen. 10 said anything about it in the report. 10 MR. GESSER: Fifteen, excellent. Q. Did you form the opinion that the 11 11 BY MR. GESSER: 12 view was reasonable? 12 Q. So let's take a look at page 30. 13 A. I really have very little information (Document review.) 13 14 about what internal investigations were in fact 14 Q. Do you have that calculator that I 15 ongoing at AOL during this time period other 15 gave you before? 16 than Purchase Pro. 16 A. I do. 17 Q. But with respect to the Purchase Pro 17 Q. Okay. So if you were to take these 18 investigation, do you have any view as to what 18 numbers that appear on page 30 in the April 10th was already publicly known and whether what was 19 report for cable, filmed entertainment, 19 20 already publicly known would encompass what was 20 networks, music and publishing, would you agree contained in the email that is Black-16? that those numbers would represent the Time 21 21 22 22 Warner 2001 combined revenue estimate? MR. FOX: Objection. 23 A. I do not have a view. 23 Α. Yes. Q. I promised if there was time that we 24 24 Q. So I'm going to ask you to add those would get back to the Time Warner numbers for 25 **up.**

Page 287 Page 286 1 B. Black **B.** Black 1 2 A. Okay. For which period? 2 about the April 10th -- I mean if you look at 3 Q. 3/31/01 estimate, the first quarter 3 the bottom of page 10, this is all within the section of the April 10th, 2001 CSFB report; is 4 estimate. 4 5 5 A. Okay. that right? (Witness complies.) 6 6 A. Yes. 7 7 A. Okay. Q. Okay. So are you suggesting that 8 Q. What's the total number that you get? it's possible that Kiggen raised the Time Warner A. I get 7154 in millions of dollars. 9 numbers, revenue numbers, but left the first 9 10 Q. And just so we're... 10 quarter numbers alone? 11 Just so we're clear, back on page 11 11 MR. FOX: Objection. of your report you indicated that Kiggen A. My recollection is that the overall 12 12 increased the Time Warner revenue numbers by 13 full year Time Warner revenue numbers went up at \$800 million and then you indicate, "It's hard the same time that the AOL full year revenue to see this change in Time Warner revenue was numbers went down, and I don't have that 15 15 either honest or reasonable." 16 16 recollection tied to the first quarter of 2001. 17 Q. But presumably some of that would be 17 A. That statement is about the full year 18 numbers. It wasn't about the first quarter 18 in first quarter or do you think it's possible 19 that all of the increase in revenue occurred in numbers. 19 20 20 other quarters other than the first quarter? So I don't have a recollection as to 21 whether there were changes from Laura Martin's 21 A. It's certainly possible it was in the view to, in January, to here in April in the 22 22 other quarters. first quarter numbers or whether these refer to 23 Q. Why would that be? 23 24 later quarters. 24 It's certainly possible. 25 You just don't know sitting here 25 O. But you're talking in your report Page 288 Page 289 B. Black 1 B. Black 1 2 today. 2 know what page it is because my pages are cut 3 3 off. It's page 5 maybe? A. I don't know today. O. Okay. All right. I'm nonetheless 4 4 Do you see revenue numbers? 5 going to go through this exercise because I 5 A. So let me make sure I'm looking at think it's worthwhile to do. 6 6 apples to apples. 7 7 MR. GESSER: So if you now going to Okay, yes. So I see revenue numbers, business segment results for AOL Time Warner for 8 mark this as Black 17. 8 9 9 (Defendants' Exhibit Black 17, the first quarter of 2001 and they include 3 Excerpts from 10-Q dated 3/31/01, marked month revenue and 3 month EBITDA. 10 10 for identification, as of this date.) Q. Okay. So if you were to add up the 11 11 12 BY MR. GESSER: 12 numbers for cable, film, networks, music, publishing, would that give you the actual first O. So if you turn --13 13 quarter 2001 Time Warner numbers? 14 MR. FOX: This is the entire 10-Q? 14 15 MR. GESSER: I believe it is not the 15 MR. FOX: Objection. 16 entire Q, is it? 16 A. I'm not sure it's an apples to apples 17 MR. FOX: I don't know. I'm just 17 comparison. asking. It looks like it just ends on 18 18 Q. Why not? A. Because the CSFB report has a 19 19 page 7. 20 20 relatively small -- so I guess the difference is MR. GESSER: I don't think it's the that there's an intersegment elimination and I 21 entire O. 21 really want to trace through, since there is no 22 MR. FOX: Do you have the entire Q? 22 23 MR. GESSER: No. comparable intersegment elimination line in the 23 CSFB report, whether these numbers are truly 24 24 BY MR. GESSER: Q. So turning to page -- it's hard to 25 comparable. 25

Page 291 Page 290 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 Q. But the intersegment elimination 2 O. Okav. So vou're not sure whether 3 number would actually make the AOL numbers 3 these numbers here that are listed under 2001 4 higher, right? 4 historical are numbers that are useful because 5 5 A. If one imagined taking the of the intersegment elimination; is that right? 6 MR. FOX: Objection. 6 intersegment elimination and spreading it 7 7 through the networks, then the numbers in the A. Yes. I'm not sure how to deal with 10-Q for the networks would go down. They would the fact that intersegment elimination exists in 9 have to go down because the total is still the one document and not the other, and it may well 10 same total. So if I take the minus 428 and move 10 be that with further work, I could figure that 11 it up to zero, I have to move something else 11 out, but I'm reluctant to do it on the fly. 12 down by 428, spread across the various 12 Q. Okay. If you look at page 12 of your 13 13 divisions. report, Table 3. 14 Q. And so you think that --14 A. Okav. 15 A. I'm -- so I'm just not sure that I'm 15 Q. You have a first quarter 2001 revenue 16 doing a head-to-head comparison here. 16 number for AOL's actual? Q. And you've never done this 17 17 A. I have a number for what I call AOL 18 calculation before? 18 actual, which is what we've been calling in this 19 I thought you said you looked at this deposition America Online, yes. 19 20 20 Q. Okay. And that's 2125; is that before. 21 A. I believe that I did a full year 21 right? analysis and I didn't look specifically at the 22 22 A. Yes. first quarter, and so I'm reluctant to form a 23 Which is the same number that appears 24 view on the fly as to whether these numbers 24 on the page that we were looking for -- looking 25 match up directly or not. 25 at previously in Black-17; is that right? Page 292 Page 293 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 2 A. I'd have to go back and look at Q. Okay. 3 3 Black-17. A. Okay. So I get... 4 4 So if I, if I do that, that's the (Computing.) 5 same -- I see the same 2125 number for AOL in 5 I get 7683 as a total I believe. 6 the 10-Q as I see in my Table 3. 6 Q. I'm sorry. What did it come out to? 7 Q. So that whatever intercompany 7 Α. 8 elimination issue or intersegment elimination 8 Q. Okay. Why don't you do it again. 9 issue existed, it didn't prevent you from 9 Okay. 10 pulling the 2125 number into your table; is that 10 (Computing.) 11 right? 11 A. I get 7383. 12 12 That's more like it. A. That's correct. My Table 3 would be before intersegment elimination. A. Okay. And so before I had 71 --13 13 14 Q. Okay. So let's just do the numbers, 14 O. Five four. 15 as I indicated, by adding up -- you add up 15 -- 54, and if I were to observe 16 cable, film, network, music and publishing in division by division, it looks like there was a 16 the page we're looking at in Black-17 and just large, putting aside the intersegment issue, it 17 17 18 let's compare it to the number we got when we 18 looks like there was a large upward variation in the actual results for film data entertainment. 19 added up cable, film, networks, music and 19 20 So they probably had a hit film in the first 20 publishing in the April 10th CSFB report. 21 A. I'm happy to do that with the caveat 21 quarter but that would be knowable information. that again, I don't know how CSFB handled 22 I just don't know it. intersegment elimination. We verified how I 23 The other four segments as a whole 24 are roughly comparable. 24 handled it, but we don't know how they handled

25 it.

25

Q. Okay. So getting back to areas of

Page 294

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

25

B. Black

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

18

19

20

21

Case 1:02-cv-12146-NG

your expert report that you may no longer feel comfortable with, let's turn back to page 11.

Are you still comfortable with the sentence at the beginning of the second paragraph, "It's hard to see how this change in Time Warner revenue was either honest or reasonable"?

MR. FOX: Objection.

A. I really would want to go back and see where and how the increase in TW revenue came in and I -- you know, you have persuaded me for a different table that I was using restated numbers instead of original numbers and I should have been using the original numbers.

On this one I think I would simply 17 say I would need to do more work to know whether 18 I would want to change this opinion.

Q. Okay. So this is now a tentative and 19 20 subject to further inquiry or is this off the 21 table but could come back on the table subject 22 to further inquiry, or you're still comfortable with this but it's possible that further inquiry 23 24 will make you no longer comfortable with it? 25 MR. FOX: Objection.

Page 295

B. Black

A. I'd say that further inquiry is appropriate and I don't see why it's worth speculating on whether I'm comfortable subject to further inquiry or I might become comfortable with further inquiry.

O. Fair enough.

MR. GESSER: Let's take a five-minute

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The time is 5:53 p.m.

(Recess is taken.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the record. The time is 6:00 p.m.

This is the beginning of the tape labeled No. 6.

BY MR. GESSER:

18 Q. We only have a few minutes left, but 19 I have a couple of questions that I just wanted 20 to clear up.

21 One is on page 13 of your report, 22 Table 4?

23 Do you remember how you got the 24 numbers that are in this table?

I'm not asking you to tell me how,

Page 296

B. Black I'm just asking do you remember how you got these numbers?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Looking back on page 12, there's a, it's not quite a table but it's some numbers at the bottom of the page that are arranged.

You have a 62 multiple for AOL?

10

11 Q. Okay. Can you explain to me how you 12 get that?

13 A. I believe that I took that from the 14 Fidelity presentation.

15 Q. Is that number actually in the 16 Fidelity presentation or do you derive it from the Fidelity presentation? 17

A. I don't recall.

O. And the 18 multiple?

A. That was a...

(Document review.)

22 A. I'm now thinking that these multiples 23 might have come out of the April 10th published

24 report.

Q. And you have that somewhere, right?

B. Black

A. I have that, yes.

Q. Okay. Why don't you take a look at it and see if that helps you figure out where these multiples are coming from.

So I'm now looking at the April 10th report and at Table 10 of that report, which is on page 35, and it has a 62 multiple for AOL and multiples for the different divisions of TW here by -- AOL is what it says on the page which 10 we've been calling America Online. 11

And I believe that I computed the blended 18 multiple for Time Warner as a sort of EBITDA weighted multiple of the multiples that are shown for the different divisions of AOL in this report.

Q. Okay. Table 10 is titled "AOL Time Warner Private Market Value Analysis"; is that right?

A. Yes.

21 Q. Do you know what that means?

22 A. I believe so, yes.

23 Q. So what is a private market value 24 analysis?

A. I think this is an effort to estimate

Page 297

Page 298 Page 299 B. Black 1 B. Black 1 2 what a buyer would pay in purchasing these 2 **Table 10?** 3 businesses on a whole company or I should say 3 MR. FOX: Objection. whole segment basis. 4 4 Other than here? 5 5 Q. Why is that multiple relevant to the BY MR. GESSER: 6 6 calculation you're doing in D of your report? O. Other than here? 7 A. This is certainly one common way of 7 There aren't that many companies that A. 8 arriving at a company valuation for a complex were that large in market cap at the time or now 9 and I don't recall -- I do not affirmatively multidivisional company is to try to value the recall having seen that analysis for one of the 10 pieces separately and a multiple of EBITDA is a 10 11 common way to value businesses separately. 11 small number of companies that would fall within 12 Common way to value businesses. 12 that category. 13 O. All businesses? 13 Q. Have you ever -- do you know of any 14 A. In practice, one sees different reason why the private market value analysis 15 metrics commonly used for different businesses would not be particularly useful for a company 16 and indeed one sees that to some extent in Table 16 as large as AOL or any business units as large 10 where they use a dollars per homes past as the AOL business units that are listed in 17 17 18 metric for cable assets rather than an EBITDA 18 **Table 10?** metric as their primary metric, but there are 19 MR. FOX: Objection. certainly businesses for which a multiple EBITDA 20 20 A. Let me offer a complex answer. 21 is a useful and used metric. 21 First, it's not clear to me the 22 Q. Have you ever seen a private market 22 extent to which the multiples that appear in 23 value analysis being done on a company as large this analysis are different than multiples that 23 as AOL Time Warner or a business unit as large 24 one would use in a public market value analysis. as any of the business units that are listed in And second, no, I don't see any 25 25 Page 300 Page 301 1 B. Black 1 B. Black 2 reason why it would be inappropriate to conduct 2 A. Okay. I see that. a private market value analysis as a way to 3 Do you remember that? 4 4 estimate the value of AOL as a whole. Α. 5 Q. You read Laura Martin's deposition 5 Q. So you did remember that. transcript. A. I'm now recalling that that's what 6 6 she said. I didn't -- I remembered some 7 A. I did. 7 8 8 Q. And do you recall her having any discussion of it. 9 concerns about using a private market value 9 I do not agree with her statement analysis for AOL? 10 10 here. 11 A. I recall that there was some 11 Q. Why do you not agree with her 12 discussion of that in the deposition. 12 statement? Q. Do you remember what her view was? 13 13 A. One could perhaps say that the AOL unit was too big to buy, but the other five 14 A. Not specifically. 14 15 Q. If you look at page 180 of her 15 segments were not too big to buy and it seems deposition. perfectly appropriate to value them using a 16 16 17 (Document review.) 17 private market analysis. Q. So you disagree with Laura Martin's 18 Q. Starting at actually the bottom of 18 page 179 with the sentence, "I think..." 19 view here? 19 Do you see that? 20 20 A. I disagree with Laura Martin's view It says, "I think one of the reasons 2.1 21 as it applies to everything except the America Jamie and I decided ultimately not to use a 22 Online segment. private market value analysis, even though I use 23 Q. Are you committing fraud? MR. FOX: Objection. them in the rest of my businesses, is because it 24 was too big to buy." 25 A. One would hope not.

	Page 302	Page 3	303
3 disa 4 con 5 6 in n 7 6 8 9	B. Black Q. Okay. So just because someone agrees with Laura Martin doesn't mean they're mmitting fraud. A. I do not recall offering that opinion my report. Q. That's not what I'm asking. A. I would agree with MR. FOX: Objection. A. I would agree with the statement that	B. Black THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're now go off the record. The time is 6:10 p.m. This is the end of Tape labeled No. 6 concluding this video deposition. (Time noted: 6:10 p.m.) BERNARD BLACK	
12 evid 13 (14 15	agreeing with Laura Martin is not convincing dence of committing fraud. Q. Let's end on that. MR. GESSER: Thank you. (Continued on next page to include jurat.)	11 12 13 Subscribed and sworn to before me 14 this day of 2008. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	
	Page 304		 305
5 6 BE 7 8 M 9 10 11 Des 12 Defet 13 Repo 14 Defet 15 repor 16 Defet 17 Price Adve 18 19 Defet 17 price from 20 21 Defet 22 23 Defet	INDEX tness Page CRNARD BLACK IR. GESSER 7 INDEX OF EXHIBITS scription Page Indants' Exhibit Black 1, Rebuttal 20 ort of Professor Bernard Black Indants' Exhibit Black 2, Expert 24 ort of Professor John Dayton Indants' Exhibit Black 3, 75 swaterhouseCoopers IAB Internet ertising Revenue Report Indants' Exhibit Black 4, Excerpts 91 AOL's 10-K dated 3/21/00 Indants' Exhibit Black 5, Excerpts 93 AOL's 10-K dated 11/30/00 Indants' Exhibit Black 6, Excerpts 99 AOL's 10-K, dated 6/30/00	1 INDEX OF EXHIBITS (Cont'd.) 3 Description Page 4 Defendants' Exhibit Black 7, Morgan 109 Stanley Dean Witter Analyst Report 5 dated 1/19/01 6 Defendants' Exhibit Black 8, Transcript 135 of deposition of Laura Martin 7 Defendants' Exhibit Black 9, Email 139 8 dated 1/11/02 from Martin to several individuals and attached research 9 report Defendants' Exhibit Black 10, Email 146 10 dated 1/12/01 from Martin to Kiggen and Watters 11 12 Defendants' Exhibit Black 11, "Desk 189 Notes" dated 2/1/01 13 Defendants' Exhibit Black 12, "Desk 196 14 Notes" dated 1/16/01 15 Defendants' Exhibit Black 13, "Desk 202 16 Notes" dated 1/16/01 17 Defendants' Exhibit Black 14, Series of 233 emails including email dated 3/15/01 from Watters to Wang and Martin 19 20 Defendants' Exhibit Black 15, Credit 249 Suisse First Boston report dated 21 4/10/01 22 Defendants' Exhibit Black 16, Email 259 dated 7/11/01 from Lorenzo to Kiggen, 23 Watters 24 Defendants' Exhibit Black 17, Excerpts 288 from 10-Q dated 3/31/01	

A
abbreviations 8:7,8
ability 117:18 283:20
able 66:10 84:18 147:9
187:9,15 261:15
absence 69:22
absolute 112:8 123:12
absolutely 226:7
absurd 56:9,14,20,25
57:16,19 58:4 59:12
80:24 81:16 82:24
83:3 85:8 86:16,19
103:15 104:3 123:5
absurdity 57:25
absurdity 37.23
absurdly 218:23
academic 17:8 19:9
159:11 161:3
accept 183:4,9 194:10
201:9 228:10
accepted 182:19
accepting 106:18 166:3
203:24 204:9
access 33:10 132:20
135:11 244:22,23
245:3 247:15 257:14
257:21
accomplish 38:21
account 46:15,16
151:22,22 224:2
accounted 72:17 73:3
73:18 74:8
accounting 264:15
282:16,25
accumulated 119:22
accuracy 228:16
accurate 51:9 53:14
74:15 76:18 78:10,23
97:7 103:25 107:20
165:2 167:14,18
226:13,16 228:19
229:17 246:16 307:11
accurately 51:10 171:2
234:13
accused 282:19
achieve 150:2
acknowledging 63:21
acquisition 13:11
acquisitions 17:20
18:21
action 307:14
ACTIONS 1:8
activities 282:17
actual 106:8 152:24
162:10 165:4 187:14
249:10 254:19 255:11
255:17 289:13 291:16
201.19 202.10

291:18 293:19

ad 103:22 106:25

```
136:21 137:5,9
  158:15 166:23 174:14
  218:7 219:22 220:5
  220:14 256:8 263:20
  276:19
add 44:23 168:6 179:18
  179:20 180:3 184:6
  228:6 285:24 289:11
  292:15
added 186:23 292:19
adding 292:15
addition 21:11 282:14
additional 37:8 54:7,7
  54:9,9,23 55:2 209:25
  210:3
address 30:18,24 52:22
adjective 124:9
adjust 37:7
administer 5:14
admit 7:21
ado 199:21
adopt 179:10
ads 72:16 73:2,16 74:7
  74:10,18 263:22
advantage 117:23
adverse 224:13
advertisers 142:19
advertising 19:24 25:6
  25:16,18,21,23,25
  26:10,11,16 27:7,13
  27:16,23 28:5,9,11,14
  29:5,21 30:4 35:2,3,4
  47:8 51:22 52:7
  55:18,22 65:13 74:3
  75:8,18,19,21 76:3,11
  77:5,7 78:14 79:6,8
  79:13,18,22 83:5 84:3
  84:16,23 85:4,20,24
  86:3 105:17,20 106:8
  106:13,21 107:19
  108:2,8 111:3,8,9
  112:8,23 113:12,14
  113:21,25 114:2,9
  116:7 117:15 118:10
  118:23,24 119:11,23
  119:25 129:4 132:21
  133:2,7,9,15 134:7,12
  135:15,17,21 137:16
  137:18 138:5,14,16
  138:21,22 139:3,4
  140:2,8,11,14,16
  141:10,14,15 142:12
  142:13,16,25,25
  143:5,7,8 144:12
  155:16,17 156:7
  199:19 216:22 217:2
  264:20,23 304:17
advised 256:8
affairs 256:6 263:19
```

•
266:4 273:10 276:18
277:3,11,23 283:2
affect 27:17,24 28:10
28:15 29:5 35:5
26.13 29.3 33.3
111:19 133:21 157:2 199:17 209:20 210:7
199:17 209:20 210:7
226 14 270 20
226:14 278:20
affirmative 135:4
170:21 171:23 178:7
affirmatively 107:13
135:5 299:9
afforded 150:24
aggregate 77:18 84:21
aging 117:11
aging 117.11
ago 17:14 220:15
223:14
agree 22:8 29:22 40:9
72:20 73:5 89:18
101.25 105.21 124.9
101.43 103.41 124.8
126:11 132:13 144:11
101:25 105:21 124:8 126:11 132:13 144:11 147:25 172:9 177:7
100.10.100.12.100.2
190:18 198:12 199:3
203:16,20 258:19
280:14 285:20 301:9
301:11 302:8,10
agreed 5:2,7,11 23:6
183:16
agreeing 260:3
ahead 53:14 142:3
260:13
ain't 57:9 158:21
algebra 15:8
Algebraically 66:24
alleged 126:5
allegeu 120.3
allow 183:13
allowed 147:3
allowing 49:7
alter 186:5 187:21
altered 181:18
altering 182:2,8 188:5
alternative 272:20
Alumex 242:15,16,17
242:18
America 8:17 9:8,9
46:5 48:6 55:9 57:22
62:19 64:2,6 68:17
72:24,25 73:17,18,24
74:2,17 88:8 89:5,9
91:23 96:18,20
114:16 121:25 138:19
168:6,10 169:9
182:18 186:20 246:21
265:8,8,23 268:25
277:25 291:19 297:11
301:21
amount 18:2 26:8
49:19 279:6
analogize 196:21
analogous 196:15
-

Document 305-27

```
analyses 59:3,5
analysis 15:19 21:15
  29:3,3 32:24 43:12
  44:22 48:10 49:3
  55:16 58:12,16 59:11
  61:19 62:13,21 63:2
  64:13 65:16,19,22
  70:3,5,10,18 71:13
  79:23 80:3 81:2
  82:16 83:20 84:24,25
  85:4,7,22 106:19
  120:8 125:13,17
  126:16,22 127:4
  134:5 157:24 163:16
  168:12 201:2 208:16
  212:2,6 241:19,20
  252:9 263:12 283:7
  290:22 297:18,24
  298:23 299:10,14,23
  299:24 300:3,10,23
  301:17
analyst 18:7 19:10
  21:19 28:18 30:11
  32:23 35:8 36:7 37:8
  40:25 41:25 42:4,6,10
  42:11,13,17,20,22
  43:4,11,14 44:2,13,17
  45:8 53:23 81:9
  109:5,9 116:4 121:6,9
  121:13,14,19,23
  134:21 148:16 149:8
  149:10 158:7,21
  163:14 167:23,24
  169:2 176:21 195:24
  197:10 198:3 199:25
  201:24 223:23 244:25
  260:20,22 263:2
  305:4
analysts 17:3,4 18:13
  18:13,18,23,25 19:20
  29:24 30:2,9,12,24,25
  31:11,11 33:2,7,8,19
  33:22 34:5,14,22
  35:10,15,20 36:24
  37:22 39:15 40:12,14
  41:10,21 43:25 44:6
  44:11 45:4,7 56:22,24
  81:5 107:25 108:5,6
  108:16,21,23 119:4,9
  119:23 120:8 133:23
  155:2 156:4,24
  157:11,14 158:7,12
  158:19 159:12,18,19
  159:24 161:2,4 162:7
  162:18 169:23 197:11
  198:5,6 221:20
  244:21 245:8,9,17,18
  246:24 247:7,18,23
  249:5 258:12,15
```

```
263:25
analyze 48:15
analyzing 43:18 45:15
  46:12
and/or 231:3
Annette 1:24 2:12
  307:8,21
announced 34:2 256:10
  270:14 272:2,10,23
  274:5,18,19 275:4
  276:11 278:6,23,24
  280:10,12,23 281:10
  281:21
annual 86:2 106:16
  116:11,15
annually 75:25
answer 8:2 15:9 16:10
  25:12,13 26:22 32:18
  34:10 37:10 41:7
  43:8 44:7 45:21,22,23
  46:2 47:4 48:14
  53:10,21 59:6 65:16
  79:4 90:25 95:25
  115:13 117:4,5,8
  136:25 137:2,8,17,25
  138:3,9 144:3 147:10
  151:18 162:3,24
  170:13 171:6,9,10,12
  171:14,20 172:4
  173:23 182:4 184:21
  206:19 213:16.22
  214:5 222:20 223:25
  232:23 257:24 299:20
answered 26:25 53:4
  107:22 115:12 152:15
  171:5,16 177:16
  181:20 213:25 253:3
  256:22
answering 46:25 53:14
  164:22 196:13.25
  210:10,15 213:7
  260:14
answers 46:24 86:10
  137:7
Anthony 266:21,22,25
  268:8,9
anticipation 98:11
anymore 218:22
anyway 158:25
AOL 1:4 6:5 8:16,19,20
  9:4,4,5,8 12:12,12
  21:10,19 22:7,11 25:7
  25:8,23 26:13 27:17
  27:24 28:6,10,15,19
  29:5,21 30:4,11,25
  31:14 34:2,16 35:5,11
  35:25 37:8 40:23
  41:2.21 44:6.11.13
  45:8 46:14 47:7,7,18
```

47:19,23 48:7,11 49:2 51:22 52:8,17 53:23 60:5,24 63:16 64:2,10 64:23 66:15 69:19 70:16 72:16.16.23.25 73:23 74:12 77:8,24 78:4,11 79:10 80:6,8 80:12 81:14 82:14 83:5 90:8 92:21,24 94:6 95:16,18,20 96:12 97:3 105:16 106:23 111:8 112:7 112:16 113:11,13,25 114:6,16 115:16 117:14,21 119:2,4 120:5,9,10 121:24 122:15 123:23 125:5 126:6 128:25 129:18 130:15 133:4,22 144:20,21,22 145:25 146:22 147:15,19 149:10,25 150:15 151:3 154:18 155:5 155:19,25 156:5,8 157:7,8,15,21 158:12 158:16,18,20 159:25 160:2,5 161:16,24 162:12 166:5 167:23 169:4,16,20,23 170:7 170:17 172:12 175:7 178:8 179:10.19 181:16 182:11,12 184:4,5,7 186:4,20 189:21,22 192:6 193:20 194:4,7 195:24,25 196:11 197:18 199:20 200:2 201:2,12 202:3 204:5 204:13 208:4 210:4,7 214:14 217:3 218:8 219:19 227:3,19 229:4,9,24 230:21 231:18,24 232:6,8,12 233:4,11 234:17,23 235:11,20 237:14 243:5,12,16 245:22 246:8,20,24 247:7,9 248:4 249:7 252:4,10 252:17,18,21 254:2 260:18 262:5,5 263:4 264:19,25 265:6,24 267:19 268:18 273:8 274:12,17 276:16 278:4,10,18,20 280:5 280:9 281:24 282:14 284:15 287:14 289:8 290:3 291:17 292:5 296:9 297:8,10,15,17 298:24 299:16,17

300:4,10 301:13 306:3 **AOL's** 37:4 38:7 52:2 55:9,17 77:12 78:15 79:7,21,25 90:9,17 91:5 92:8 93:19 99:3 99:17 105:10 108:2,7 111:17 118:14 139:25 154:3.13 157:16 158:8,10 160:16,20 161:18 163:19 166:3 173:4 199:18 200:10 201:6,11 207:23 208:25 210:8.21 211:21 212:15 215:12 216:10 219:18 235:25 236:18 251:23,25 256:6,8 273:9 283:4 283:10,17 291:16 304:19,21,23 **apart** 194:22 **apologize** 91:11 145:18 282:9 apparent 22:22 apparently 186:23 209:6 280:6 appear 14:21 31:19 96:16 175:18 176:19 285:18 299:22 appearances 6:8 **appeared** 31:5 176:3 appearing 175:17 appears 52:2 76:12 109:24 142:11 191:20 251:18 291:23 **apples** 289:6,6,16,16 application 116:24 applied 169:9,11 **applies** 301:21 **apply** 247:17,23 248:15 248:18 approached 167:21 approaching 85:21 appropriate 15:16 52:21 53:2,12,20 55:25 61:2,4 62:22 63:3 65:23 97:2 242:9 261:2 262:16 264:6 269:20 271:14 295:3 301:16 appropriately 52:19 approximately 251:20 **April** 40:22 41:4 46:13 125:19 126:24 145:10 149:14 185:17 249:16 249:18 285:7,18 286:22 287:2,4 292:20 296:23 297:6 area 16:17 19:21,22

32:16 121:20 122:3 163:15 198:18,20 areas 32:11,17 164:4 293:25 argument 238:16,22 242:4 arithmetic 15:8 **Arlequin** 1:24 2:12 307:8.21 **Arps** 4:5 6:19 17:15 arranged 296:8 arriving 298:8 art 266:9 article 19:11 268:3.11 268:14 269:5 272:11 274:10 275:13,18 278:24,25 280:12 articles 275:7 **ascribing** 266:10,12 aside 37:11 51:7 52:25 73:13 117:12,17 134:7,10 160:17 169:7 293:17 asked 22:21 25:3 26:24 51:16,20 52:17 64:22 80:16 86:9 92:6 107:21 115:11 130:3 130:25 171:4 172:2 173:9,11,24 181:17 212:10 239:18 240:10 253:3 256:20 266:16 269:14 asking 7:14 10:15 14:25 28:25 29:25 43:3 53:12 66:17,19 67:8,18,19 70:5,13,15 71:2 76:19 78:3,5,8 78:18,20 80:23 95:8 95:20 119:17,18 120:7,16,22 143:21 143:22,25 144:2 152:21 155:12 163:20 173:12,18,21 182:22 183:9 185:25 186:10 186:12 202:24 203:3 221:8 222:19 224:7 230:15 238:11,15 255:13,14 258:5 273:18 281:12,16 288:18 295:25 296:2 302:7 **assertion** 229:8,12

249:5 associate 17:16 associated 188:20 **assume** 9:15 44:7 70:16 77:22 78:10 182:16 204:25 209:4 264:9 269:17 270:9 273:17 assumed 129:7 231:4 269:15,21 273:20,22 assumes 148:4 **assuming** 36:13,16 77:6 78:9,22 153:9,10 153:12,14 175:15 183:15,15 186:4 195:15,17 207:17 251:14 259:12 260:15 261:6 263:11,11 273:25 283:2 assumption 77:11 128:23 129:5,11,16 130:2,4,5,24 131:5,9 131:10,11,13,15,18 132:6,15,16 133:3 144:17 175:11,24 179:21 182:23,25 183:16,20 186:11,25 187:3,17,19,20 190:21,23 192:8,13 192:25 193:9 195:5,7 195:13 227:7,25 228:12 229:11,14,20 229:21 230:15,24 231:2 235:19 240:9 240:12,15 252:16 273:25 274:3 275:2 283:19,24 284:2,3,6,9 **assumptions** 128:16,20 128:22 189:19 235:15 241:2 272:16,17 astonishing 86:2 attach 234:9 attached 139:10 143:17 145:4 151:21 152:9 214:12 305:8 attaches 139:17 191:4 attachment 143:11 165:8,8,11 213:14,16 213:19 215:15 attachments 209:4 attempt 57:8 161:11 attempted 52:22 **attempting** 53:16,21 attention 229:22 attentive 49:8 attorneys 3:6,16 4:6 5:3 attributable 180:19 attributed 115:9 attributing 111:14

audience 142:21 audit 90:22 **August** 1:15 2:5 273:6 273:16 274:5,6,16,20 274:23 275:4,5,5 278:7,25 280:10,23 281:11,14,21 306:4 307:12 author 266:20 authored 196:23,24 202:3 208:17 authorized 5:14 **available** 46:10,18 48:18 93:11 119:15 128:21 131:6,16 132:7 133:14 135:18 170:10 192:22 228:24 235:16 241:3 243:2 269:12 273:9 **Avenue** 2:11 3:9,19 average 65:5 averse 224:16 **Avi** 3:21 6:10 7:13 aware 33:5,25 35:13 42:18 93:2 125:25 134:18 140:4 193:24 197:15 198:2,10 208:9 210:24 227:22 244:13 249:15,16 282:14,23 **a.m** 2:6 6:7 72:4.7 В

B 7:6,6 8:1 9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 18:1 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1 25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1,12 30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1 37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1 46:1 47:1.14 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1 52:1 53:1 54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1 62:1 63:1 64:1 65:1 66:1 67:1 68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1 72:1 73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1 77:1 78:1 79:1 80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:1 89:1 90:1 91:1 92:1 93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1 97:1 98:1 99:1 100:1 101:1 102:1 103:1 104:1 105:1 106:1

assess 33:9,12 35:23

assessment 168:8

assignment 51:15

assets 298:18

assigned 255:6

assessing 46:21 169:18

55:23

107:1 108:1 109:1	284:1 285:1 286:1	196:21	229:24 230:20 231:17	30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1
110:1 111:1 112:1	284:1 285:1 286:1 287:1 288:1 289:1	basing 38:15	231:18,22,23 232:6	34:1 35:1 36:1 37:1
113:1 114:1 115:1	290:1 291:1 292:1	basis 11:5 23:16 36:20	233:2,3 235:10,20	38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1
116:1 117:1 118:1	293:1 294:1 295:1	43:23 52:10 56:2	243:6,23 244:2	42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1
119:1 120:1 121:1	296:1 297:1 298:1	61:4 63:18 87:18	245:22 246:2 248:6	46:1 47:1 48:1 49:1
122:1 123:1 124:1	299:1 300:1 301:1	96:23 98:24 108:16	249:7 254:23 266:3	50:1 51:1 52:1 53:1
125:1 126:1 127:1	302:1 303:1 304:10	109:2 115:15,21	272:7 277:4,12	54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1
128:1,9,9 129:1 130:1	305:2	116:3 118:5 124:12	281:13 283:23 288:15	58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1
131:1 132:1 133:1	back 13:6 29:15,19	124:14,25 125:6	290:21 293:5 296:13	62:1 63:1 64:1 65:1
134:1 135:1 136:1	37:17 40:5 48:9 50:2	126:2,22 145:23	297:12,22	66:1 67:1 68:1 69:1
137:1 138:1 139:1	50:10 51:17 60:8	168:21 169:18 170:21	believed 33:13 38:8,12	69:14 70:1 71:1 72:1
140:1 141:1 142:1	62:9,14 72:6 75:11,11	177:13 178:3,4,7,9	38:16 130:25 150:8	72:11 73:1 74:1 75:1
143:1 144:1 145:1	80:15 88:17 93:4	181:17 193:9 226:7	150:12 166:5 224:17	75:6,13 76:1 77:1
146:1 147:1 148:1	96:13 103:21 104:17	229:8 231:11 232:20	believes 218:19,20	78:1 79:1 80:1 81:1
149:1 150:1 151:1	112:25 123:17 128:4	241:5,7 256:13 298:4	236:16 237:18	82:1 83:1 84:1 85:1
152:1 153:1 154:1	128:14 153:9 170:23	bear 16:22 111:22	believing 178:4,9	86:1 87:1 88:1 89:1
155:1 156:1 157:1	173:7 181:6,12	132:9	bell 19:8	90:1 91:1,4,9,21 92:1
158:1 159:1 160:1	189:15 191:2 210:17	beat 255:5	benefit 48:11,16	93:1,17,18 94:1 95:1
161:1 162:1 163:1	212:12 224:21 226:25	Becker 44:10	Bernard 1:13 2:9 6:4	95:10 96:1 97:1 98:1
164:1 165:1 166:1	230:9 253:13 256:18	becoming 74:20 180:13	20:7 278:18 279:5	99:1,16 100:1 101:1
167:1 168:1 169:1	259:25 260:25 262:8	232:20	303:10 304:6,13	102:1 103:1 104:1
170:1 171:1 172:1	280:18 284:25 286:11	beginning 62:13 72:8	306:5,19	105:1 106:1 107:1
173:1 174:1 175:1	292:2 293:25 294:3	80:22 128:6 181:8	Bernstein 247:25	108:1 109:1,8 110:1
176:1 177:1 178:1	294:10,21 295:13	230:11 294:5 295:15	248:15,22	111:1 112:1 113:1
179:1 180:1 181:1	296:5	behave 160:4 169:2	best 10:9 16:10 69:18	114:1 115:1 116:1
182:1 183:1 184:1	backdrop 103:14	belief 36:21 139:25	85:9 103:5 125:23	117:1 118:1 119:1
185:1 186:1 187:1	background 14:13 26:8	148:4,7 153:10,13,15	127:2 151:24 165:10	120:1 121:1 122:1
188:1 189:1 190:1	34:25 38:6 56:18	169:16,17,19 175:12	165:23 166:13 179:18	123:1 124:1 125:1
191:1 192:1 193:1	58:20 69:4 156:21	175:13 181:17 204:12	better 42:6,13,16,22	126:1 127:1 128:1,13
194:1 195:1 196:1	158:11,18	228:22 277:10,14,15	43:4 44:13,18,19 63:5	129:1 130:1 131:1
197:1 198:1 199:1	backing 112:21 114:2	beliefs 31:3,7 34:25	64:9 114:24,25	132:1 133:1 134:1
200:1 201:1 202:1	backlog 79:15,17	36:16 108:17 125:23	239:22	135:1,22,23 136:1
203:1 204:1 205:1	bad 25:21,23 27:13	130:19 145:24 146:22	beyond 42:20 154:6	137:1 138:1 139:1,7,8
206:1 207:1 208:1	166:24	152:13,18 153:4	199:2	140:1 141:1 142:1
209:1 210:1 211:1	baffled 160:14	161:16 167:15,20	bias 49:7 226:21	143:1 144:1 145:1
212:1 213:1 214:1	Baker 44:10	168:5,7,10,20 169:4	239:24 248:13	146:1,7 147:1 148:1
215:1 216:1 217:1	banker 18:10	169:15 170:11 172:22	biased 226:17 238:5,21	149:1 150:1 151:1
218:1 219:1 220:1	banking 243:11,16,19	172:23,25 175:9	245:19	152:1 153:1 154:1
221:1 222:1 223:1	243:20 244:8 247:14	176:6 185:3 219:10	big 162:5 281:24	155:1 156:1 157:1
224:1 225:1 226:1	248:8,10,12,14,17,23	221:13	300:25 301:14,15	158:1 159:1 160:1
227:1 228:1 229:1	banks 17:2 245:9	believe 12:18 13:7,10	bigger 158:15	161:1 162:1 163:1
230:1 231:1 232:1	base 74:4 106:18	13:14 24:14 28:2	biggest 62:4,16	164:1 165:1 166:1
233:1 234:1 235:1	117:20 haged 26:10 22:21	36:18 37:2,6 38:13,17	bill 11:5	167:1 168:1 169:1
236:1 237:1 238:1	based 26:19 32:21	39:10,10,13,17 43:21	billion 34:4,4 79:15	170:1 171:1 172:1
239:1 240:1 241:1	38:24 39:2,17 42:4	45:2,17 67:25 80:11	112:17,18 124:13,15	173:1 174:1 175:1
242:1 243:1 244:1	69:13,18 82:14 83:4	89:24 112:15 114:15	190:15 194:16 234:24	176:1 177:1 178:1
245:1 246:1 247:1	85:7 87:16 97:7	121:12 125:21 128:24	250:25 251:15,20,25	179:1 180:1 181:1,11
248:1 249:1 250:1	101:21,25 104:7	129:25 131:24 133:4	253:6	182:1 183:1 184:1
251:1 252:1 253:1	131:2 132:11 133:18	133:10 135:16 136:7	Bilotti 44:9 121:4,17	185:1 186:1 187:1
254:1 255:1 256:1	142:10 150:21 154:15	144:15 147:20 148:3	bit 21:13 55:19 64:9	188:1 189:1,9,14,15
257:1 258:1 259:1	155:7 160:24 163:12	152:25 157:20 158:14		190:1,2 191:1 192:1
260:1 261:1 262:1	166:3 179:23,25	161:13 162:25 170:5	132:24 205:19 241:18	193:1 194:1 195:1
263:1 264:1 265:1	183:5,8 208:15	170:15,15,22 172:11	black 1:13 2:9 6:4 7:12	196:1,4 197:1 198:1
266:1 267:1 268:1	213:12 220:25 222:8	178:7 179:8 180:9	8:1 9:1 10:1 11:1	199:1 200:1 201:1
269:1 270:1 271:1	228:23 243:19 261:16	181:21 182:23,25	12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1	202:1,8 203:1,6 204:1
272:1 273:1 274:1	281:16	183:3 184:5 188:17	16:1 17:1 18:1 19:1	205:1 206:1 207:1
275:1 276:1 277:1	bases 36:20	201:14 202:2 203:9	20:1,6,7 21:1 22:1	208:1 209:1,15,16
278:1 279:1 280:1	basically 11:5 55:17	212:20,21 218:21	23:1,25 24:1,2,3 25:1	210:1 211:1 212:1,3
281:1 282:1 283:1	59:23 62:12 83:8	227:3,19 229:4,9,11	26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1	212:23,25 213:1
	ı		ı	

		l	1	l
214:1,16 215:1,15	board 247:18	266:4 268:24 273:10	carrying 64:24	206:9 207:23 210:6
216:1 217:1 218:1	boards 17:24	275:14 276:18 277:3	carryover 188:25	221:10,11,12,25
219:1 220:1 221:1	body 19:19	277:11,23 283:2	case 1:6 10:6 12:15,20	251:19 254:10 277:19
222:1,24 223:1 224:1	booked 282:17	289:8 298:24,25	13:2,2,7,9,10,15,18	280:8 286:15 294:6
225:1 226:1,8 227:1	Boston 3:17,18 8:10	299:16,17	13:21,22 18:24 19:6	294:18
228:1 229:1 230:1	152:24 153:2 175:7	businesses 298:3,11,12	23:10 24:21 26:3,11	changed 38:15 51:9
231:1 232:1 233:1,16	249:22 305:20	298:13,15,20 300:24	26:13,18 30:6 41:10	83:13 98:25 232:11
234:1 235:1 236:1	Boston's 147:18	buttons 104:23	42:5 45:2 47:19,20	233:9
237:1 238:1 239:1	bother 23:5 254:16	buy 245:16 300:25	48:5 54:17 61:14	changes 50:11,25
240:1 241:1 242:1	bottom 110:6,10,14	301:14,15	112:5 138:12 152:4	286:21
243:1 244:1 245:1	136:16 140:19 212:6	buyer 298:2	154:7 157:18 159:18	changing 220:12
246:1 247:1 248:1	217:4 280:4 287:3		163:15 180:9 181:22	232:20
249:1,21 250:1 251:1	296:7 300:18	<u>C</u>	218:13 225:9 226:18	characterization
252:1 253:1 254:1	bought 64:10	C 3:2 4:2 29:13 47:14	226:23 231:6,22	126:19 129:11 196:18
255:1 256:1 257:1	bounced 55:14	128:9 307:2,2	241:15,25 242:15	211:10
258:1 259:1,7,8 260:1	brackets 25:8 113:15	cable 137:12 285:19	257:2 259:2 266:3,23	characterized 56:8,16
261:1 262:1 263:1	brain 122:11	289:12 292:16,19	277:4,12,13,17 306:3	chart 64:15 66:15,17
264:1 265:1 266:1	break 36:3 65:9,12	298:18	cases 18:3 19:7 47:12	70:20 76:22 78:4,6,8
267:1 268:1 269:1	71:15,17,17 114:23	calculate 87:14	159:17	78:9,19,21,22 86:8
270:1 271:1 272:1	127:10,17 147:9	calculation 14:17 88:4	category 39:9 40:5	111:24
273:1 274:1 275:1	174:21 180:25 181:2	88:21 89:3,19,25	299:12	check 107:16,24 203:8
276:1 277:1 278:1	181:12 198:5 230:4	95:15,23 97:2 100:17	Catherine 146:14	254:16 269:21
279:1 280:1 281:1	230:14 295:9	101:21 122:18 179:25	191:4 233:24 234:7,8	checked 203:11
282:1 283:1 284:1	breaking 174:20	181:21,25 182:7	234:13	Christmas 64:10
285:1,7 286:1 287:1	breakout 114:7	188:3 198:13 203:7	cause 95:2 177:15 caused 126:5 210:6	chunks 228:25 circled 202:13
288:1,8,9 289:1 290:1 291:1 292:1 293:1	Bricklayers 3:6 bring 231:10 236:22	290:18 298:6	211:21 215:11	circulation 205:22
294:1 295:1 296:1	246:5 251:8 254:12	calculations 11:19 13:5 14:10,15,20 15:5,7,11	causes 94:23 247:13	circumstances 222:11
297:1 298:1 299:1	bringing 16:22 132:8	15:13,15 16:8 20:21	caution 267:12	CK 7:6
300:1 301:1 302:1	163:17	180:18 183:5,8	caution 207.12 caveat 292:21	claim 19:15 44:19,21
303:1,10 304:6,12,13	broadcast 137:12	calculator 66:10,10	caveats 172:13	126:2 217:11
304:14,16,19,21,23	broader 84:2 156:2	285:14	CCR 1:24 307:21	clarity 50:3
305:4,6,7,9,12,13,15	broadly 53:19	calendar 100:25 101:6	CC'ing 146:14	class 3:8 128:24 201:3
305:17,20,22,24	broken 122:15	101:9,12 122:24,24	cell 48:22	227:2,9 228:7,11,14
306:5,19	brought 245:25	California 275:19	central 133:22	228:17,21 229:2,15
Black-1 20:15	bubble 55:9,10 59:14	call 8:19 16:25 17:12	centrally 148:15,18	248:5
Black-10 146:6,12	59:23 60:5,14 61:6,17	33:6 40:6 52:17	certain 9:19 36:6 125:4	clear 10:9 23:16 54:16
191:2 195:12	62:5 80:18,19 81:12	55:20 86:17 96:15	276:6	60:21 129:17 134:6
Black-11 189:8 195:12	81:20 82:16 87:3	123:10 148:15 158:3	certainly 16:23 20:13	135:18 138:11 159:7
Black-12 196:3 199:21	building 252:9	159:5 211:8,11,12	23:10 25:22 30:5	162:12,14 166:4
211:5	bull 245:22	233:11 291:17	41:23 43:11 48:2	193:8 201:18 206:22
Black-13 202:7	bullish 217:9,20 218:11	called 7:6 17:21 34:3	49:6,13 59:25 86:6	207:5 286:11 295:20
Black-14 233:15	218:17 219:22,25	49:7 108:24 138:14	90:9 108:18 116:10	299:21
Black-15 249:20	220:3,17	197:17 209:10 245:9	125:6 144:15 150:11	cleared 215:20
Black-16 260:22	bump 84:23	245:10	152:16 155:17,18	clearer 39:25
282:10,12 284:21	bunch 130:12 236:25	calling 20:14 39:8	165:7,12 168:13	clearly 57:11,13,19
Black-17 291:25 292:3	bundled 114:17	291:18 297:11	169:10 197:22 216:20	66:17 116:14 117:14
292:17	buried 99:22	candid 147:3 150:22	218:5 222:12 226:20	134:8 195:10 221:23
Black-2 24:7	burst 55:9,10 59:14	151:12	228:25 237:3,4 244:6	224:12 253:16
Black-3 75:5	60:14 62:5	cap 299:8	244:23 245:13 246:11	climbing 105:12
Black-4 90:17	bursting 80:19 81:12	capable 44:21	246:11 257:20 265:18	close 54:18 56:20 57:10
Black-6 99:15	82:15	capture 106:23 112:10	270:22 271:3 278:15	99:22 108:25 194:20
Black-7 109:5 122:9	business 16:7 43:12	113:5 115:17 183:24	287:21,24 298:7,20	200:10,11 216:24
Black-8 222:14	44:19,20 74:12 85:15	capturing 105:19	Certified 2:12	closely 19:16
Black-9 139:15 210:18	85:19 92:11,17,21	care 38:22,23 155:20	certify 307:10	closer 150:11 214:16
210:18 211:18 215:11	184:11 243:12,20	166:11,12 184:4	cetera 78:23	246:19
216:7	244:8 247:14 248:8	215:6,7	change 49:17 67:12	closest 194:14,17
blended 297:13	248:12,15,18,23	careful 45:18 46:19	103:9 104:12,18	coauthor 12:23
blood 307:14	256:6 262:4 263:19	carry 142:19	108:11 204:10 206:8	Coke 183:14
	<u> </u>			<u> </u>

collectively 246:13 color 238:6
color 238:6
com 103:22 256:8
263:20
combination 92:17
172:22
combinations 92:12,22
combine 169:16
combined 9:5,8 63:7,13
63:17 64:3 169:15
172:24 181:14 182:10
190:12 265:6 276:2,5
285:22
come 17:8,21 29:15
40:5 83:25 90:20,21
96:9 99:12 150:19 166:7 168:7,17 184:8
166:7 168:7,17 184:8
208:19 232:10 236:19
245:12 252:6 259:25
293:6 294:21 296:23
comes 55:17 161:24
162:17 177:18 195:8
236:20
comfortable 9:21 51:3
132:5 149:20 150:7
153:16,17 164:21
218:2 273:25 294:3,4
294:22,24 295:4,5
coming 59:25 85:18
111:22 195:11,14,18
259:12 266:7 276:19
297:5
comment 220:3
commerce 74:4 79:22
84:3,16,23 85:5
112:21 276:19
COMMISSION
306:25
commissions 245:12,14
committed 225:5
committing 301:23
302:4,12
common 98:21 298:7
298:11,12
commonly 298:15
communications
231:16
companies 15:23 17:25
42:7 60:22 133:19
160:4 217:2 276:7
299:7,11
company 43:18 59:8
63:17 64:4 73:25
118:11 119:10,12,25
120:3 145:10 150:12
159:2 166:12 168:8
197:12 198:4,7
244:22,25 245:4
247:15 252:24 262:6

263:5 269:22,24,25
270:3,10,14 276:2
280:6 281:24 298:3,8 298:9,23 299:15
company's 261:3
comparable 185:21
199:5 248:24 289:23
289:25 293:24
compare 106:4 192:18
193:6 292:18
compared 77:20 98:8 116:10 121:6 160:3
comparing 113:25
193:5 202:22
comparison 120:18
195:8,11 289:17
290:16
comparisons 76:2
compensation 11:9,12
243:19,25 244:4,10
244:10,14,15 245:11 245:17
competing 196:23
208:16
competition 118:7
complete 185:18 206:5
226:5
completely 49:14
complex 298:8 299:20
complicated 43:8
261:12 270:8
complies 136:13 286:6 component 143:8
188:11
components 56:5 79:16
compound 147:8 239:2
compute 101:17
computed 297:12
computing 104:15
293:4,10
concentrated 118:17 276:16,18 277:23
concentration 118:11
118:22 119:3,10,24
120:2,4
concept 189:5 concern 25:20 218:7
247:13,14,14,15,21
concerned 215:2
244:21 245:3,7
concerning 277:25
283:4,10 concerns 25:5 27:4
51:24 52:9 135:13,16
138:4,13 300:9
conclude 31:13 71:4
concluded 71:11
concluding 303:5
conclusion 23:6 51:25

```
154:8 155:11,13
  161:15 163:4,11,21
  233:6 273:23
conclusions 15:17
  111:20 125:2 132:11
  135:7 208:11 220:25
  222:8
conduct 14:15 15:18
  25:11 26:6 52:4
  138:23 270:25 271:4
  300:2
conducting 26:14 48:10
Cone 44:10
confidence 61:10,24
  82:22 86:13
confident 82:23 83:2
  155:23
confidently 85:6
confirm 202:25 260:18
  261:4 264:7
confirmed 98:5 178:6
  203:24 264:5
confused 166:15
 215:17.19 236:3
confusion 8:24 10:8,11
  215:20
conjunction 173:12
consensus 33:6 35:10
consider 15:21 16:11
  16:12.18 19:17.23
  50:5,8 197:24 208:10
  224:9 236:15 241:18
  247:17 271:24
consideration 224:4
considerations 151:23
  152:2
considered 120:8
  175:19 197:7 272:4
considering 81:10,11
consisted 242:3
consistency 35:23,24
  35:25
consistent 10:9 22:22
  31:3,6,7,20,20,25
  33:13 34:7 40:14
  54:10 69:22 96:16
  108:8 113:24 118:25
  128:20 129:16,20
  131:5,15,19 151:5
  154:10 161:2,5 169:3
  171:22,24 172:3
  188:2 192:25 224:24
  225:2,10,20 235:16
  235:18 240:11,15
  241:2 243:2 247:3,4
  254:18 269:11 273:8
 274:25 281:2,4
consistently 44:23
```

Document 305-27

52:10 131:12,14,17

contact 13:12.24 **contain** 108:21 contained 223:21 283:9 283:16 284:21 containing 130:15 contemporaneous 127:3 contents 267:4 context 236:15 237:22 continue 129:25 243:13 260:14 Continued 302:15 continuing 20:20 contracts 79:13 contrary 129:9 contrast 65:20 contributions 114:5 Cont'd 4:2 128:11 305:2 conversation 271:12 conversations 37:12 267:11,13 conversely 158:20 228:11 conveyed 151:7 convincing 302:11 copy 97:17,20 copyable 117:19 **copying** 110:13 core 262:4,4 **corporate** 13:10 15:24 16:2.13.15 17:20 18:21 43:13 44:16 correct 10:21 18:8,11 30:13 32:4,8 36:11 41:16 45:9,14,16 47:10 48:12 53:6 60:7 63:25 81:3,7 89:17,18,24 93:14 94:19 95:23 100:17 102:2,15 103:11 124:5 125:5 129:10 132:12 134:13 135:15 145:25 147:7,15 159:21 165:3 170:7 175:10 176:23 177:2 180:6 182:24 195:16 210:8 214:20 215:24 216:3 233:7 242:4 251:5 252:19 254:4 258:13 267:19 268:13 268:17 272:19 274:18 276:8 292:12 correctly 28:21 29:4 30:15 120:11 146:3 184:3 188:18 245:24 275:13 correspond 100:8 cost 108:19 142:20

counsel 6:8 128:19 130:13,25 267:11,14 count 83:11 counterfactual 182:23 183:2.8.10 **counts** 83:19 **COUNTY** 307:6 **couple** 12:24 83:16 96:13 148:11 232:17 295:19 **course** 16:8,15 104:12 129:8 130:22 215:25 231:5,21 264:7 270:25 271:4 court 1:2 2:12 5:16 7:3 courts 159:18 cover 7:24 214:20 **coverage** 151:3 181:15 **covered** 30:25 44:6,11 246:24 248:4 **covering** 28:18 35:11 149:10 169:23 197:12 247:7 crazy 58:6,8,9 create 10:7 creating 182:20 **credible** 162:18 256:6 256:14,17,22 259:13 260:16 **credit** 1:4 3:16,17 6:5 6:11.14.17 8:9.10 21:18 39:15 41:18 45:7 53:23 125:12,14 126:3 147:18 152:23 153:2,21 165:3,4 170:16 171:3 172:18 175:6 181:15 182:12 192:5 193:20 199:23 219:10 221:14 226:15 228:8,18 229:16 235:10 249:10,21 305:20 306:3 credited 226:12 **cross** 104:2 124:21,22 crossing 228:5 crucial 256:8 crunch 111:11 crunching 110:25 crux 39:22 **CSFB** 8:9 22:3,21 23:2 31:5 33:24 35:8 40:22 41:3 43:21 44:25 46:14 48:16 125:19,24 126:15 130:21 148:14 153:24 154:9,22 158:13 176:22 184:15 190:19 194:7 195:24 197:16 201:11,22 208:3,19

216:24 218:4 219:18 223:22 227:24 228:2 229:3,25 243:12,21 250:24 256:8,20 273:9 282:23 287:4 289:19,24 292:20,22 CSFB's 21:9 36:7 129:2,19 144:23 165:15 172:3 189:22 193:15 195:9 218:7 225:20 229:5 230:22 231:10,19 232:6,9 233:12 235:21 243:15 244:16 255:15 curious 20:23 cut 82:10 110:13 234:17,23 235:3 276:22 289:2 CV 1:6

D **D** 7:6 128:9 298:6 304:2,10 305:2 Daily 197:17 199:22 205:11,22 206:24 207:18 211:6.7.13.15 211:19 216:9 **Daniel** 3:22 6:13 **data** 62:9 65:3 69:8,13 70:19 71:3 77:18 78:8,9,22 80:18,20 81:9 126:17 164:3 220:20,21,25 222:7,8 223:3,9,10 293:19 date 11:23 20:9 24:5 59:16,23 75:9 91:7 93:21 99:19 109:11 109:13 125:21 136:2 139:12 143:12 146:10 154:20 161:9 164:23 167:10,11 189:11 191:22,24,25 193:25 196:6 202:10 209:3 231:12 233:19 235:20 249:24 251:2 253:6 259:11 288:11 306:4 dated 50:18,22 91:5,13 93:19 99:17 109:9 139:9.16.17.18.19 146:8,14 189:10 196:5 202:9 215:16 231:9 233:17 249:22 259:9 288:10 304:19 304:21,23 305:5,8,10 305:12,14,16,18,20 305:22,24 dates 194:25 daughter's 116:18

Davis 2:10 3:15 6:10,14

6:16 day 46:23 116:19 154:6 204:4 214:21 228:21 269:5 270:12 303:14 306:21 307:18 days 49:21 83:11 160:2 **Dayton** 21:7 24:4,8,13 25:3 27:19 51:16,20 53:5 122:9.10 304:15 **Davton's** 21:17 23:14 51:14 Dayton-2 23:24 Dayton-3 75:4 **Dayton-9** 215:10 deadline 49:21 deal 291:7 dealings 283:4,10,17 deals 20:19 79:14,17 282:17 **dealt** 8:19 **Dean** 109:6,9 112:6 125:18 305:4 **December** 223:7 246:2 decide 57:11 132:4 141:20 171:19 214:7 **decided** 300:22 decision 244:16 decisions 19:5 244:15 **declining** 129:3 133:5 deep 25:20 99:22 defendant 6:20 **defendants** 3:16 6:12 6:15,17 20:6 21:3 24:3 75:6 91:4 93:18 99:16 109:8 135:23 139:8 146:7 189:9 196:4 202:8 225:9 233:16 238:19 249:21 259:8 288:9 304:12 304:14,16,19,21,23 305:4,6,7,9,12,13,15 305:17,20,22,24 define 57:6 defining 39:24 definite 187:15 279:17 degree 61:8,10 delete 124:9,18 deleted 177:4 deletes 177:6 DeMarco 19:7 demonstrates 139:24 denied 264:6 **denominator** 265:17,20 deny 260:19 261:5 department 16:6 depend 135:13 258:24

depended 138:15,20

79:12 135:8

dependent 36:22 39:13

depending 22:10 202:21 217:2 222:11 258:23 **depends** 113:7 **DEPONENT** 306:5 deposed 7:15 256:25 266:23 deposition 1:11 2:8 5:12 6:3 12:2,5 24:11 24:12,14,17,20 130:23 132:10 135:24 136:5,17 137:20 218:25 219:4 220:19 221:3,9 222:14 224:19 237:24,25 239:9,22 240:5,7 243:24 257:4 258:2,4 258:7,9 262:7,20 267:5,10 271:15 280:25 291:19 300:5 300:12,16 303:5 305:6 depositions 75:11 derive 296:16 **describe** 103:20 123:13 123:15 described 123:9 160:24 271:21 describing 53:19 description 241:23 304:11 305:3 designed 21:3 desire 234:14 243:10 Desk 189:9 196:4 202:8 305:12,13,15 **despite** 203:25 detail 41:14 54:5 82:17 209:14,16 212:22 214:19 275:22 279:6 detailed 149:12 186:16 212:2 **details** 54:7,9 **determine** 23:5 25:12 247:2 248:20 283:8 determining 40:19 198:11 219:9,16 **develop** 43:18 **developed** 96:11 132:3 developing 108:24 development 268:24 developments 35:4 140:2 224:13 **Diet** 183:14 difference 66:20 68:9 95:9 96:23 158:17 192:14,15 202:16,21 203:4,12,17,21 289:20 **different** 9:14,25 10:14

Document 305-27

15:10 25:19 27:12 32:11 36:5 38:16 61:11 70:13 78:25 81:22 94:11,21,22 95:19,21 98:3 112:4 112:20,20,23 133:24 142:16 144:13 152:20 153:9 156:23 172:5 176:12 178:10.15.22 179:9 180:20 184:10 185:7 186:6,13,18 197:13 198:8 209:15 224:16 270:5 271:23 281:4 294:13 297:9 297:15 298:14,15 299:23 **difficult** 10:5 48:19 49:4 198:13 199:5 dimension 32:7 direct 13:12 113:12 direction 165:7,12,14 280:15 directly 22:2 49:9 245:12 290:25 directors 17:25 disagree 25:14,17 27:3 52:11 172:10,12 201:4,5 237:13 301:18,20 disagreed 28:23 disagreeing 34:6 262:10 302:11 disagreement 39:21 40:2 disagrees 302:3 disbelief 233:9 disclose 153:3 261:9 279:9 disclosed 134:10 172:14 210:19 211:19 212:14 214:13 215:11 216:7 218:4 221:14 223:22 257:20 261:24 263:2 274:9 disclosure 157:20 160:17,18,19 161:15 163:18 164:11,15,18 165:2,3 166:16,18,20 167:6,7,14,18 170:25 172:17 discounted 238:7 discrepancy 94:17,24 95:2 96:25 180:18 181:24 discuss 56:4 188:14,17 188:19 discussed 168:12

discussion 300:12 301:8 dispositive 240:6 **dispute** 26:4 138:17,25 169:8 **disputed** 138:11 disputing 23:16 disregard 218:11 dissemination 150:25 207:19,21 dissent 172:8 196:10 207:24 dissenting 172:23 dissents 197:11 **distinction** 38:19,20,21 38:23 39:5 distinguish 27:21 218:15 distributed 87:20 207:18 **distribution** 151:16,17 **DISTRICT** 1:2,3 divide 67:23 89:21 **divided** 67:23 **dividing** 102:16 division 38:4 64:6 72:16,23,24 73:2 74:18 89:6 149:11 182:18 243:21 264:23 268:20,25 270:13 271:20 293:16.16 divisions 129:21 130:16 290:13 297:9,15 **document** 1:7 75:14 76:18,20 92:20 94:3 109:24 110:17,22 146:17 200:5 211:24 231:21 233:5 239:5 254:7,22 273:4 277:7 285:13 291:9 296:21 300:17 documents 131:8 154:20 195:23 232:16 239:15 283:22 doing 31:2,2 32:24 35:16 44:21 48:10 49:3 59:3 70:3 79:10 117:23,25 122:19 125:13 130:16 158:13 253:20 264:21 290:16 298:6 dollars 88:20 112:8 150:16 191:18 203:15 203:15 250:19 286:9 298:17 domain 27:6 37:3 149:23 **double** 203:8

doubt 22:13 138:12

discussing 209:13

183:21

276:24 **doubtful** 154:21,23 **doubts** 220:17 downturn 28:4,5,9,11 29:4 30:3 59:15 133:20 downward 246:8,13,19 Dr 3:8 201:2 draft 49:23 54:6 125:20 126:24 143:14,18 145:4,6 146:4 149:22 152:9 153:25 191:4,8 193:21 204:22 212:23 212:24 214:22 **drafted** 191:12 **drafts** 54:17 dramatically 61:11 draw 222:8 drawing 132:10 135:19 **driver** 72:15,17,22 73:2 73:17 74:7,19,23 drop 215:12 **dropped** 254:3 **drops** 162:16 due 129:3 133:5 178:21 181:25 **duly** 7:7 duplicative 51:6 **D.C** 275:17,19,21 \mathbf{E}

E 3:2.2 4:2.2 7:6 128:2 128:2,9 304:2,10,10 305:2,2 307:2,2 earlier 7:12 62:11 63:5 65:16 71:10 74:10 80:6,16 93:4 96:12 136:20 149:2 162:19 165:9 191:22,24,25 213:11 250:24 earliest 154:19 early 117:22 154:16 222:4 227:11 229:23 230:19 231:14 **earnings** 194:24 217:9 217:13,18 **EBITDA** 34:4 40:22,25 41:3 58:23 129:3 144:22 145:25 146:4 184:9 189:22 190:16 190:19 191:12,17,20 192:4 193:14,15,19 194:3,8,16 195:9,10 195:12,16 230:2,23 231:20 235:4 249:13 251:19 252:4,17,18 252:22 253:18 289:10 297:14 298:10,18,20

economically 203:20

economy 56:20 **edited** 50:16 editing 49:20 education 14:13 effect 5:15 21:20 55:8 70:5 92:16,17 115:21 118:4 156:4,6,8 157:15 158:15 166:20 173:3 198:11.15 204:13 208:24 216:25 264:20 effective 142:20 **effectively** 172:8 193:3 193:4.18 effects 19:10 efficiency 14:2,6 158:4 161:6 efficient 207:13,20 effort 49:14 93:5 108:19 161:10 297:25 eight 238:17 eighty 203:10,14,15 either 28:22 29:8 31:2 53:4 128:25 141:8 147:23 153:11 157:24 187:10 201:14 202:4 202:22 229:25 230:21 254:10 261:4 264:6 271:25 274:20 279:8 286:16 294:7 Eleven 82:9 elimination 250:18 289:21,23 290:2,6 291:5,8 292:8,8,13,23 **email** 139:8,15,20,23 140:5,9,13,15,17,24 143:17 145:5 146:7 146:13,20 147:13 150:3,9 151:19 152:3 152:6 164:24 191:3 194:15 209:5 211:18 214:12,21 215:2,7,9 216:6 217:5 218:3 219:2 220:14 221:13 223:21 225:8,17,22 231:9,20 232:24 233:14,17,21 234:2 234:16 235:18 236:25 240:3 249:8 251:10 251:13 253:8,9,12,21 256:19 259:8 260:21 261:17 264:12,16 266:8,20 268:6,7,9 269:6,8 272:12,22 273:15 276:12 277:2 277:5 280:3,15 282:6 283:9,16 284:21 305:7.9.18.22 emails 25:6 36:14,22

37:11,21 39:4 129:14 130:12,13 132:9 133:17 136:21,24 138:5 139:23 141:18 146:21,25 150:23 151:7,13 172:13 215:25 218:9 231:13 231:15 232:2,25 233:17 237:12 238:23 239:21,23 253:15 256:19 266:5 280:21 305:18 embarrassing 246:4 **employed** 228:2,18 229:3 **employee** 257:10 278:19 employees 264:25 268:23 282:16,18 encompass 284:20 encompassed 190:20 ends 227:12,16 288:18 engaged 21:6 92:21 engagement 160:9 enormous 90:13 enormously 186:16 entertainment 285:19 293:19 **entire** 90:13,15 168:8 214:6 288:14,16,21 288:22 entirely 112:19 151:19 175:2 241:12 244:24 entitled 132:2 entity 8:17,25 9:8 63:7 63:13 276:6 environment 155:15 174:15 equally 272:8 equals 89:16 203:10 equivalent 174:8 **ERRATA** 306:2 error 83:17 **especially** 34:8 77:16 174:13 **ESQ** 3:11,12,21,22,23 4:9 essentially 241:9 estimatable 28:17 29:23 estimate 11:24 28:19 29:24 30:3 56:16 69:8 88:18 89:5 102:21 122:16 123:25 151:24 156:17 165:10 165:23 247:22 253:18 265:3 285:22 286:3,4 297:25 300:4

83:12,14 253:23,25 255:9 estimates 57:22 87:17 129:2,19 179:16 217:9,13,18 221:25 229:5 230:2,22 231:11,19 232:6,9 235:21 estimating 32:20 112:18 114:4,8 et 78:23 **Europe** 235:5 evaluate 35:19 58:14 event 242:22 everybody 79:12 118:16 158:25 everything's 223:11 **evidence** 27:18 31:23 64:22 71:10 76:22,25 77:4,19 129:9 138:18 152:3 168:9 170:4 171:24 182:6 199:6 231:5 269:12 270:4 281:2,4 302:12 **evolved** 118:10 ex 71:5 226:21 exact 32:18 56:10 exactly 96:10,14 164:5 165:19 166:9 172:6 175:16 176:18 183:18 183:19 217:12 220:10 227:12.14 239:25 examination 7:10 128:11 138:24 examine 31:4 **examined** 7:8 118:12 examining 198:15 **example** 40:21 46:4 49:25 55:7 58:2 147:11 158:6 193:13 264:13 examples 193:17 exceeded 283:3,9 exceeds 283:17 Excel 14:24 15:2,3 excellent 285:10 excerpts 90:13,15 91:5 93:19 99:17 288:10 304:19,21,23 305:24 exchange 137:23 exclamation 204:21 exclude 96:17,21 excludes 140:16 excluding 224:4 excuse 64:2 **executives** 244:22,25 245:4 247:15 **exercise** 102:25 288:5 **exhibit** 20:4,6,12 24:3,7

51:14 75:6 90:16,17 91:4,9,22 93:18 95:10 97:22 99:16 100:21 104:24 109:8 116:13 128:14 135:22.23 139:8,14 146:7 150:9 151:15 189:9 190:2 196:4 202:8,19,20 204:16 209:15,17 212:3,9,23,25 214:11 214:17 215:16 233:16 249:21 259:8 288:9 304:12,14,16,19,21 304:23 305:4,6,7,9,12 305:13,15,17,20,22 305:24 exhibited 108:12 exhibits 90:24 exist 36:17 70:4 120:3 172:13 197:24 existed 81:10 281:14 292:9 existence 36:22 261:5 existing 69:21 **exists** 291:8 **expand** 118:2 expansion 118:6 **expect** 68:14,23 77:13 79:5 118:5,6 149:11 168:4 258:15 279:11 expectation 71:5 115:24 117:20 expectations 119:2 **expected** 63:22 82:13 252:13 273:7 275:24 **experience** 17:10 81:21 **expert** 10:20 12:11,22 16:12,19 18:3 19:18 19:21.23 21:3 24:3.8 126:11 130:3 131:21 132:2 159:15 160:15 163:13,15 164:4 169:12 203:4 235:14 241:5,16 254:12 294:2 304:14 **expertise** 14:14 15:18 16:12,17,21 17:7 121:21 122:3 132:9 144:19 157:24 161:14 163:3,17,20 164:6,8 198:18,20,23 experts 12:20 13:2,18 24:21 **EXPIRES** 306:25 **explain** 53:17 55:4 296:11 explanation 208:17 221:7

estimated 28:21,21

explicit 243:24 244:14 253:21 **explicitly** 189:3 196:23 252:3,8 273:12 **exposure** 226:23 **express** 208:21 240:21 **expressed** 25:5 33:16 37:21 108:9 119:3 138:5 expression 127:3 expressly 9:13 extend 259:25 extensively 17:20 extent 9:21 28:8 39:12 58:25 63:15 65:25 78:13 138:18 155:25 183:7 192:7 197:23 229:13 239:7 247:20 252:15 277:22 298:16 299:22 extra 50:15 83:9 extraordinarily 117:25 extremely 74:3 e-commerce 55:22 113:14 114:3.10

F 128:2 304:10 305:2 307:2 FACCHIN 4:14 **face** 86:2 165:20 fact 25:14 37:20 41:4 42:2 45:12 51:5 58:4 60:12 80:17 107:17 118:10 135:8 144:16 150:21 162:10 178:22 180:19 198:14 210:21 219:17 233:21 238:6 238:18,18 240:13 242:11 252:9 258:20 276:4,6 283:22 284:14 291:8 **factors** 160:24 facts 132:2.4 266:2.6.7 factual 128:20,21 131:6 131:15,19,25 132:7 132:11 138:17,25 151:6 168:21 169:7 170:10,20 228:24 232:19 235:15,16 240:11,14 241:2,17 243:2,4 269:12 272:6 274:12 factually 41:10 283:21 **failing** 60:22 failure 39:9 40:5 **fair** 37:23 40:3 49:19 54:20 74:6 104:5

126:19 138:10 148:8

168:13 169:4 186:11 196:18 207:6,10 211:10 241:22 262:19 295:7 **fairly** 51:12 161:25 219:8,15 270:7 faked 117:17 fall 99:13 136:22 299:11 False 263:22 familiar 18:24 19:13,16 20:11 267:4 275:20 familiarity 19:14 26:12 **far** 118:14,14 134:12 153:16 159:2 194:22 faster 213:18,21,22 favor 139:2 favorable 225:9 **FD** 263:24 February 132:22 134:17 170:17 175:8 182:8,21 183:20 186:7 189:25 191:20 194:18 196:12 217:15 federal 164:3 feel 217:23,25 294:2 feels 41:6 44:17 96:22 107:13 212:16 236:3 239:2 fell 255:17 **felt** 246:3 fewer 276:22 Fidelity 46:6 87:17,22 88:8 105:25 108:10 109:14 124:25 125:7 125:10,22,25 126:4 126:14,18,20,24 127:2 168:13 296:14 296:16,17 **field** 17:21 **Fifteen** 285:9,10 **fight** 118:7 **figure** 76:23 187:10 291:10 297:4 **figured** 276:21 **figuring** 117:14 filing 5:4 film 289:12 292:16,19 293:19.20 filmed 285:19 **finance** 15:22,24 16:2,6 16:13,15 17:22 43:13 44:16 **financial** 12:13 17:23 18:6 44:22 59:8,21 90:10 92:15 98:22 159:5 161:5 164:2 226:23

111:16 124:12 129:8 223:25 270:25 279:3 **finding** 71:10 **findings** 131:22 **fine** 59:6 71:20 87:24 121:2 214:4 223:11 258:11 260:7,11 264:21 277:13 finely 82:11 **finer** 38:3 65:16 **finish** 16:3 45:21 46:2 **firm** 32:17 74:25 197:12 198:6 248:10 **firmer** 149:16 firms 12:15 first 3:17,17 8:10 25:4 28:13 34:8 41:9 42:25 46:17 54:4 56:12 59:13,18,20,22 60:8 64:15 65:11 67:5,16 68:11 69:3 73:14 84:21 88:13 89:10 90:7 95:6 98:2 98:18 100:9,25 101:9 103:8 104:19 105:7 117:22 128:23 132:15 147:18 148:14.16 152:23 153:2 175:7 175:19 188:25 192:15 197:4 200:20 220:7 225:21 237:9 247:13 249:22 253:11 255:7 255:10,18 285:2 286:3,18,23 287:9,16 287:18,20 289:9,13 290:23 291:15 293:20 299:21 305:20 **fiscal** 99:3,6,12 100:6 100:24 101:2,7,10,13 **fit** 134:5 **five** 12:7 61:23 69:17 69:21 84:15 140:18 140:23 220:15,20 223:2,8,14 238:18 293:14 301:14 five-minute 295:8 five-year 158:9 fix 123:21 **fixing** 123:20 flagged 93:24 99:21 109:20 flagging 10:15 **flipped** 205:16 **Flom** 4:5 6:19 **Floor** 3:9 flow 50:2,17 51:4 fly 264:11 290:24 291:11 focus 76:15 187:14

focused 26:14 48:6 93:3 213:13 214:21 **focuses** 225:21 **focusing** 219:7 221:6 follow 105:18 **following** 14:22 38:12 128:19 173:15 206:18 224:11 235:15 follows 7:9 25:14 128:10 footnote 124:10,20,22 273:17 274:2 275:2 **force** 5:15 forecast 46:13 149:13 192:24 193:2,2 forecasting 32:16,19 forecasts 34:7 144:21 145:10,14,15 154:9 158:10 161:4 165:16 189:20 194:4 **forget** 252:7 forgot 123:21 forgotten 262:24 form 5:9 26:21 30:8 32:20 53:22 57:17 82:4 84:5 103:23 106:15 119:7 125:20 153:6 156:20 168:19 175:12 199:4 270:23 281:5,7 284:5,8,11 290:23 formed 138:24 153:23 160:23 175:13 197:9 210:12 264:10 **forming** 31:9 106:6 168:22 284:2 formulating 53:11 **forth** 36:15 37:17 81:12 111:9,18 181:12 253:13 261:2 262:8 267:19 280:19 forward 21:2 35:8 36:19 40:4 116:16,22 131:21 247:3 **found** 35:7 40:24 65:17 262:17 four 4:7 29:19 55:11 61:22 62:17 84:15 100:12,23 105:20 136:11 293:14,23 **fourth** 46:5,8,15 55:15 57:21 58:21 60:16 61:22 62:24 63:9,14 63:22 64:6,8,16 65:4 65:17,24 66:14,22 67:3,6,10,14,17,21 68:5,13,15,25 69:4,11 69:14,24 70:6,9,11,11 70:12,16,21 71:6

76:13,23 77:2,14,20 77:23 81:15 83:17 86:15 88:18 93:25 98:5 101:6,13,21 102:20 104:18,25 122:16,23 123:23 245:21 247:21 **four-thirds** 203:14,15 Fox 3:5,11 6:21,21,21 6:25 9:18 12:7,9,14 12:16,21 13:20 14:16 15:6,20 17:11 19:3 20:14 21:5 23:8,25 26:24 28:7,16 29:6,10 29:18 30:17,22 31:16 33:4,20 34:18 36:9,25 37:25 39:6,19 41:22 42:8,24 43:2,6 45:13 45:21,25 47:11,25 48:13 50:13 53:7,15 53:25 54:14 57:5 58:17 62:7 65:8 66:23 68:22 71:8,15 71:18,24 73:21 75:23 76:5,16 77:17 78:2,17 79:3 80:10 81:17 85:2 86:21 95:3,24 100:19 102:9 103:4 106:10 107:21 108:14 109:22 110:9,16 112:2 114:13 115:11 117:2 118:19 119:5 119:13 120:7,17,21 120:23 122:10 123:6 126:7 127:8,11 129:12 131:3,23 132:23 134:14 138:6 139:5 140:3,12,21 141:16,23 142:8 143:2,9,18,22,25 144:5,7,9,14 145:7,12 145:17,19 146:2,23 147:5 148:10 149:6 151:4,14 152:14 153:5,22 154:14 156:16 157:25 159:9 159:14,20 160:7,22 161:19,22 163:8,22 164:16 165:21 167:16 169:5,25 170:8,18 171:4,8,13 172:19 173:5,24 174:3,18 175:3 176:4,20,24 177:4,9,12 178:17,25 179:6,13 180:7 182:14 183:23 184:20 185:9 186:8 188:7 190:6,10 192:10 193:7,23 194:9

find 45:3 98:15,22

196:20 197:6,14 198:9,17,25 199:14 200:3,6,12,17 201:8 201:16 202:24 203:6 203:19 204:8.14 206:4,9,11,15,21 207:6 208:5,12 210:9 210:23 211:22 215:4 215:13 216:14 217:16 217:22 218:14 219:20 221:2,16 222:10,19 222:22 223:24 226:19 227:21 228:9 229:18 231:7,25 234:11 235:12 237:8 238:9 238:25 243:7,22 244:5 246:17 247:11 248:25 249:14 250:3 250:9,13,22 251:11 253:3,10 254:21 257:17 258:14,22 259:5,20,23 260:3,5 260:11,24 261:18 263:10,14 267:12 269:18 270:18.21 271:8 272:14 274:24 275:11,25 276:14 277:21 278:14 279:2 279:22 282:8,12 283:13 284:22 287:11 288:14.17.22 289:15 291:6 294:9,25 299:3 299:19 301:24 302:9 **fraction** 162:21 fractional 63:18 frame 8:12 9:14 10:24 22:10 30:3 77:25 78:12 106:9 109:18 119:4 125:15 159:23 165:5 167:7 171:2 173:14 175:8,10 186:7,15 192:15,16 196:12 204:5,12 233:2 **framed** 53:18 framework 81:22 **framing** 131:4 172:20 **fraud** 126:2 301:23 302:4.12 fraudulent 126:5 Fred 127:6 216:12 Frederic 3:11 6:21 free 136:22 frequency 258:16 front 65:3 66:3,9 122:8 131:8 150:10 164:24 211:2 215:10 216:7 222:14 253:4 260:21 281:17

fruitful 110:25 115:3 frustrated 213:9 **full** 56:12 72:14 88:9,16 91:24 103:8 125:16 125:23 145:10 151:20 172:17 185:11,12,16 191:17 192:21 194:5 208:16 250:18 286:17 287:13,14 290:21 fuller 195:23 214:15 fully 134:23 210:11 218:21 225:2 264:5 **Fund** 3:7 further 5:7,11 55:16 62:9 69:18 104:8 106:19 199:21 246:5 262:11,16 291:10 294:20,22,23 295:2,5 295:6 **future** 46:20 47:15 49:10 61:5 106:12 158:10 279:16 \mathbf{G} gather 205:21 **gazillion** 150:16 gee 55:8 158:13 255:12 general 16:14,25 19:14 21:8 23:11 25:17,24 27:14,22,22,23 28:9 30:9 43:14 82:15 133:16,20 135:17 137:9 140:17 156:21 161:6,14 190:24 239:12,13 245:8 266:12 279:7,14 26:5 27:2 52:6 53:6 165:18 33:5,25 35:13 42:18 44:15 47:23 52:8 53:19 140:4 157:8,10 158:3 164:22 241:11 generated 75:19 243:20 256:7,7 248:14 263:22

generality 22:9 23:15 generally 15:22 26:15 generating 247:16 generic 34:25 **Gertner** 1:6 161:21 163:3,6,21 Gesser 3:21 6:10,10 7:11,13 10:3 14:19 20:10,16,17 23:23 24:2,6 36:10 43:3 45:23 54:20,22 71:16 71:20,23 72:2,10 73:24 75:10,12 76:6 76:19 78:7,24 91:8

93:17,22 95:11,12 99:20 109:4,12 110:11,18 117:7 120:14,19,22 122:12 126:8 127:6,9,15,20 128:12 134:16 136:3 139:7,13 140:23 141:20 142:4 143:16 143:21,24 144:4,6,8 144:10 145:15,18,22 146:6,11 147:6 159:10 161:21 167:17 171:6,11,18 173:6 174:2,5,22,24 176:23 177:2,6,10 179:4,7 181:10 184:22 189:8 189:12 190:8,11 196:2,7 198:19 200:4 200:18 201:20,21 202:6,11 203:3,7,8 206:7,10,12,17 207:3 207:11,16 208:8 215:5 216:12 222:21 222:23 226:9 230:13 233:20 249:20,25 250:6,11 251:12 259:7,18,21,24 260:4 260:7,12 267:16 270:19 282:9,13 283:14 285:4,10,11 288:7,12,15,20,23,24 295:8,17 299:5 302:14 304:8 **getting** 48:8 114:24,25 131:7 155:18 162:4 166:24 170:23 179:15 195:5,7 220:22 265:12 270:7 293:25 **give** 38:21 47:3 70:20 88:5 90:16 92:16 97:17 98:24 99:9 102:19,20 146:16 173:25 178:25 185:19 240:6 250:4 260:2 289:13 given 55:12 57:12 63:13 66:9 81:20 141:21 149:7 156:21 233:10 236:17 246:5 gives 14:14 15:18 99:23 170:20 194:16 giving 26:18 136:23 223:8 225:18 229:22 280:25 **go** 7:23 39:7 40:4,11 44:5,8 50:2,10,24 57:14 58:13,18 60:8

122:14 127:21 142:3 158:8 189:15 191:8 200:20 211:21 213:23 217:10,18 220:22 223:6,9 234:15 260:13,17 263:5 266:15 270:2 288:5 290:8,9 292:2 294:10 God 49:22 goes 27:19 59:11 116:22 149:13 going 6:6 7:20,23 8:6 8:15 9:7 20:4 23:23 29:15,19 34:12 37:13 37:15 38:5,10 39:22 44:7,8 46:23,25 47:8 53:14 58:10,21,23 60:22 62:14 67:24 68:25 69:3 71:18 72:3,11 75:3,16 80:15 84:13,14,15 86:10 89:13,14 90:12,14 91:11 97:10,13,19,20 97:23 98:9 100:20 102:11,12,12,13,20 104:17 109:4 110:24 111:7 113:5 116:4,16 123:17 127:22 128:13 131:10 141:19 142:6 150:6 153:16 154:6 155:4,22,23 156:5,7,9 156:10 158:15,21,24 158:24 159:25 162:7 162:20 166:5.25 167:4 171:11 172:12 177:24 181:3,12 183:13 186:19 194:11 202:6 207:17 212:11 222:6 226:4,25 227:15 230:6,18 233:15 238:4,15,22 242:20 250:12 255:25 257:18 259:16,18,21 259:24 260:7 261:12 267:21 275:4 276:22 277:16 285:4,24 288:5,7 295:10 303:2 **good** 31:2 44:2 90:2 92:5 93:8 120:23 179:6 Google 118:16 119:21 120:6,9,10,14 Google's 118:13,18,22

greater 239:4 **Greg** 263:24 **ground** 7:24 **group** 139:16 268:24 **grow** 105:16 116:2,5 **growing** 86:7 117:25 118:3 264:22 **growth** 47:7 55:10,12 55:14 56:3,8,8,17,22 56:25 57:4 59:12 60:11,11 61:4,5,16 62:4,11,17,21 63:2,6 63:9,23 66:13,21,22 66:25 67:9,14,20 68:4 68:7,12,21 69:5,9 70:8,22,25 71:6,12 72:17 73:3,17 74:3,8 74:19,23 76:2,10,13 77:2,15 81:5,14,23 84:12 85:12,16,18,20 85:25 86:2,15 89:23 101:17 102:6,22 103:16 104:13,20 105:2,19 106:8,12,16 106:21 107:18,25 108:7.12 111:17 112:7,11 113:2,6 115:18 116:12,16 122:20 144:11 158:10 168:14 184:9 262:5 **growths** 63:11 104:24 guess 73:22 84:9 107:4 114:11,15,21 135:3 141:10,13,13,17,22 141:25 142:2 145:3 157:22 158:23 244:11 270:22 289:20 **guidance** 34:2,6,8 129:2,18,20 154:18 154:24 155:5,22,23 156:5,10 158:8 159:25 162:13 166:3 166:6 190:3,10 227:4 227:20 229:5,10,25 230:21 231:19 232:7 235:21 251:23,25 252:2,3,11,17 guy 177:15 178:11 guys 220:14 223:5 Η

H 304:10 305:2 Hakala 3:8 13:7 160:9 201:2 half 34:8 167:3 232:3

232:17 233:23 260:2 **hand** 43:16 61:14 62:23 307:18 handled 292:22,24,24

TSG Reporting - Worldwide

61:20 93:4 98:9

102:14 103:21 112:25

118:24

grained 59:6

grant 242:2,7

275:14

gotten 85:13 86:10

great 91:10 214:19

hands 177:8
Hanlon 245:4 261:4
263:22,24 271:13
happen 150:6 155:4
162:8 196:9,15
198:21
happened 47:10,14
48:21 49:2 69:15
157:13 162:10 178:23
209:22 217:21 233:10
237:17 253:14 263:8
happening 133:19
155:20
happens 75:10
happier 107:10
happy 38:4 51:4 88:3,5
104:10 107:4,8,9
124:22 198:24 211:14
220:22 238:10 292:21
hond 92.4 21 95.22
hard 83:4,21 85:23
87:6 117:21 135:19
254:9 286:14 288:25
294:6
harm 126:5 246:12
harmful 246:4,9
hat 126:10,11
hates 166:12
head 18:15 64:25 85:11
neau 16.13 04.23 65.11
86:23 87:4 115:16
121:13,13 186:14
193:16,25 195:19
heading 113:13 128:16
head-to-head 290:16
hear 258:12,16,18,21
heard 248:3,9 259:4
heart 53:13
held 2:9 307:12
help 195:21 285:8
helpful 7:25 32:25 47:2
87:21 115:7 141:17
1/1:10 21 165:18
141:19,21 165:18
194:21 213:4 218:13
helps 297:4
hereunto 307:17
hey 57:9 166:11 220:14
263:4 276:21
high 77:3 85:12 119:9
245:25
higher 40:25 60:9
63:10,21 65:7 68:12
70:17,23 71:7 76:24
77:14,20,24 112:14
118:14 147:21,24,24
188:21 191:19,23,24
192:2,4 247:22 290:4
highly 42:19 44:4 81:24
82:2,7 103:20,24
104:3 105:15 106:7
108:13,25 115:22

I
121:10,10 123:9,10
123:13,16 155:22
156:23 168:14,16
169:21 261:22 264:4
264:17 279:12
hindsight 48:11,17,17
49:7
hire 244:16
historical 75:25 291:4
history 69:19
hit 159:25 293:20
hold 117:24 118:7
153:7 206:21,21
239:13 265:4
holding 183:21 186:14
O
252:23,24
holds 132:14
holistic 58:12
Holly 44:10
homes 298:17
honest 152:7 153:10,13
153:15 169:15,16,17
169:19 172:17,22,24
239:19 254:11 286:16
294:7
honestly 178:4
hope 20:13 171:11,15
250:6 301:25
hopefully 10:11
hour 260:2
hourly 11:5,6,23
hours 11:23 12:7
259:19,22
hour-and-a-half 71:19
How's 9:6 211:13
huge 266:13 279:6
O
hundreds 265:18
266:19
hypothetical 41:7
164:11 172:20 176:16 176:17 178:19,21
176:17 178:19,21
179:2 183:25 184:2
184:17,25 185:2,18
187:11,17 197:8
199:15 208:14 210:11
210:15 212:18,19,19
246:18 261:12 263:16
270:24 271:4 278:4
hypothetically 209:21
hypotheticals 270:8
272:6
I
IAD 75.7 17 204.17

IAB 75:7,17 304:17

identification 20:8 24:5

iceberg 223:6

identical 49:25

idea 11:22

ideas 36:5

```
75:9 91:6 93:20
  99:18 109:10 135:25
  139:11 146:9 189:11
  196:6 202:10 233:19
  249:23 259:10 288:11
identified 41:18
identify 138:7
illustrates 146:21
illustrative 126:14
imagination 206:6
imagine 60:19 163:23
  208:15
imagined 290:5
imagining 174:7
  177:18
immediate 253:5
immediately 279:25
impact 18:25 25:7,22
  28:6 29:20 30:3 59:2
  59:21 79:21 138:13
  154:3,5 155:6 157:21
  159:3,12,19 160:16
  160:20,25 161:4,11
  161:16,18 162:9,10
  162:21 163:13.19
  164:12 166:18,25
  167:9 174:17 199:12
  207:22 208:4 210:21
 212:15 214:14 216:10
 252:4
impacted 216:25
impacting 155:21
impending 279:16
imperfectly 197:9
implausible 279:24
implication 200:24
implicit 46:4,6 56:3
  228:12 244:3
implies 263:20
imply 154:22
important 39:11 40:19
  74:21 154:12 195:2
  212:8 219:9,15
  221:18,21 224:13
  259:14 281:11 283:5
impounded 134:23
impression 157:23
improper 220:24 222:7
  258:20.24
inaccurate 50:6,8
inappropriate 64:13
  65:19 80:4 282:16
  300:2
inappropriately 282:17
inclined 97:8 242:2,6
include 22:17 54:5,12
  62:8 98:23 229:14
  289:9 302:15
```

includes 11:25 176:17
200:2 including 217:3 233:17
245:4 305:18
incomplete 41:6 207:7
inconsistent 37:20 132:6 192:8,12 209:6
253:8,9 264:24
incorrect 143:12 incorrectly 139:18
145:20
increase 66:12 67:9,20
68:6 76:12 254:17 255:4 287:19 294:11
increased 253:23,25
255:22 286:13
increasing 17:13 incremental 113:6
independent 78:6,7,19
78:21,25 131:12
independently 129:6 index 160:3
indicate 68:19,19 100:4
129:15 241:25 247:8
249:6 256:4 277:8 286:14
indicated 9:23 13:4
14:9 95:14,22 136:7
185:25 199:7 207:25 248:13 286:12 292:15
indicates 78:4 140:6
147:13 231:10
indicating 198:21 indication 252:12
indicator 223:12
indirectly 12:10 49:10
245:13 individual 55:24
150:13 187:9
individually 58:3,14
individuals 139:10 305:8
industry-wide 160:6
inevitable 59:7
infer 150:12 inflated 282:18
influence 49:8 58:5
inform 33:23 34:15
223:19 information 17:3 25:17
27:15,22 30:6 37:9
38:13,14,25 39:2,14
39:18 46:8,9,11,15,17 52:16 65:10 93:9
97:7 100:6 107:15
108:22 119:6 120:25
121:16 132:21 133:11 133:14,24 134:11,19
134:20 135:5,9,12

```
155:8 157:4,13 158:4
  160:25 170:9,14
  192:20,22 210:2
  213:19 223:21 244:6
  256:21 257:15,21
  259:14 260:19,23
  261:9,15 262:3 263:3
  263:25 264:5,17
  265:22,23 267:7
  273:8 274:14 278:9
  278:13,16 279:8,9,12
  279:14,19,20 281:7
  281:11 283:3,8,16
  284:13 293:21
informative 133:25
  134:4 212:5
informed 33:18 34:23
  41:2 57:24 144:20
  157:6,8,10 159:5
  189:20 240:4 253:15
informing 115:7
initially 21:6
inquire 262:10
inquiry 17:9 26:7,19
  28:2 52:4 261:10
  262:6,9 294:20,22,23
  295:2,5,6
insist 259:18
instance 12:17
instances 35:7 37:15
  43:21 44:25 70:21
  159:23 161:23 180:8
  224:18
instructed 97:23
  128:18 235:14
intended 151:15,17,19
intentioned 225:23
  239:8
interactive 268:25
intercompany 292:7
interested 253:20
  307:16
interesting 133:25
  134:4
interests 225:9
intermediate 39:9
internal 25:6 35:23
  36:14,22 37:12,17,21
  129:14 133:17 146:25
  150:23 151:13,17,19
  192:3 193:14 194:15
  195:23 220:13 231:16
  282:24 284:14
internally 31:6,19,25
  43:19 180:12 187:25
International 3:7
Internet 42:11,13,20
  59:14 60:13,21 75:7
  75:17,19,20 76:3,10
```

included 27:16 100:23

77:19 111:3 112:8,22 113:14,21,25 114:2,9 121:9,23 149:9 167:23 304:17 **Internet-based** 59:15 **interpret** 217:24 235:9 interpretation 225:8,18 226:21 239:7 240:17 243:4 interpretations 225:16 240:8 interpreting 239:5 interprets 237:5,6 intersegment 250:17 289:21,23 290:2,6 291:5,8 292:8,13,23 293:17 intervened 194:24 intracompany 96:17,21 intraquarter 83:7 90:23 introduce 49:9 investigate 262:16 283:21 investigation 25:11 26:15 219:16 260:17 264:15 282:7,15,25 284:18 investigations 284:14 **investment** 17:2 18:9 243:11.15.19.20 244:8 245:9 247:14 248:7,10,12,14,17,23 **investor** 205:7,15,17,18 261:3 **investors** 17:4 44:4 149:11,17 154:12 155:7,24 156:3 199:17 205:20 208:20 209:3.7 210:6 212:5 283:6 involved 13:8 involves 13:25 **involving** 12:12 13:11 241:15 in-house 169:12 irregularities 282:19 irregularity 282:25 irrespective 37:17 231:4 244:9 IRS 242:15 **issuance** 203:25 issue 13:25 39:24 53:3 53:13 80:17,22 81:11 102:25 160:15 185:16 185:22 198:6,6 240:20 243:5 292:8,9 293:17 **issued** 90:17 152:23,25

153:2,20,21 165:4 170:16 172:7 175:15 175:16 177:14 183:17 183:18,19 185:8,11 185:14,15 186:7 187:12,22 193:25 196:16 199:9,10,23 204:4 207:24 249:10 249:16 issues 15:14 45:4 162:15 187:21 issuing 23:4 103:2

J

182:12 197:13

J 3:22 **Jamie** 22:23 31:8 34:16 34:20 36:2,15,24 39:3 42:7,9,13 121:6,9,11 125:3 137:18 146:13 148:15 149:9 151:2 154:20 158:23 167:20 167:22 168:5 169:13 170:5,11,15 171:24 172:16,22 173:17,20 174:9.10 177:14.18 177:19.21 178:12 179:9,10,19,21 180:14,19 181:12 182:17 183:17 184:3 186:3 191:3 196:11 196:24 201:13,17,23 202:3 208:2,18 229:24 230:20 231:9 231:23 234:4,5 235:10,19 238:22 239:20 243:18 245:21 247:19,23 253:19 269:4 300:22 **Jamie's** 234:13 **Jan** 140:25 **January** 22:18 25:8 36:8,8 51:22 60:20 70:6 87:18 93:6 106:11 109:6,16 116:8 125:21,21 126:23,25 132:22 133:17 134:16 139:16 139:17 140:19 143:11 145:2,3,4,5 146:4,15 153:14,20,25 154:17 164:25 165:8,24 168:20 169:19 170:5 170:17,25 171:22 175:7 179:17 182:8 182:20 183:20 185:12 185:22 186:7 192:16 193:21 194:4,7 195:14 196:11 199:24

200:11 201:7 202:15 206:23 208:3 210:20 210:24 211:20,25 212:22,24 213:12,13 213:15,18,25 214:12 214:22,23,24 215:16 215:22,23 216:9,17 217:14 223:21 224:4 224:6,11,22 227:11 227:11,18 236:23 240:3 246:2 272:12 286:22 Jessica 44:10 **JK** 235:5 job 1:24 23:18 28:18 29:23 31:2,2 33:8,10 43:17 281:6,9 **John** 24:4,8 304:15 joint 16:4 182:11 197:19 **Journal** 273:7 274:10 274:20 275:6,13 278:7,25 281:21 judge 1:6 161:21 163:3 163:6,21 164:3 241:7 241:19,25 judgment 34:23 54:4 62:19 82:5 103:23 154:16 155:14 156:20 159:5 162:22 240:19 judgments 32:21 221:23 **July** 50:19,22 227:13 227:16,18 229:7 256:5 268:4,7,10,11 268:16 272:21,23 273:15 274:14 276:12 276:17 277:5 278:23 279:4 280:12,16 282:23 jump 58:21 105:11 June 10:24 99:6 100:8 junior 17:16 278:19 279:11 jurat 302:16

K

justify 147:14

K 128:9 Kaplan 3:5 6:21,25 12:7,8,14,16 keep 35:16 48:20,25 103:13 105:12 Kiggen 22:23 31:8,13 34:20 36:2,15,24 39:3 42:7,9,13 87:14 103:14 105:10 111:14 112:17,24 115:9 121:7,9,11 125:3

146:8,13 149:9 150:23 151:2 154:11 154:21 158:23 167:22 168:5 169:13 170:5 170:11,15 172:23 173:17,20 174:9,10 178:13 179:9,22 180:3,15,20 181:18 182:2,7,17 183:17 184:3 186:4 188:14 188:21 191:3 196:11 196:24 199:10 201:13 201:17 202:4,17,19 204:4 205:8 208:18 209:19 210:13 229:24 230:20 231:9,16,23 232:5 233:3 234:4 235:10,19 239:20 243:5,18 245:21 246:25 247:9,19,24 249:7 250:20 251:8 253:19,23,25 255:5 259:3,9 261:24 263:7 263:12,16 269:4,14 269:16 286:12 287:8 305:10,22 **Kiggen's** 33:16 34:16 101:20 102:3,4,6 106:4,20 108:9 111:18,23 123:25 148:15 167:20 171:25 172:16 177:14 179:19 181:13 186:4 196:17 201:23 205:12,14 208:2 234:5 238:23 248:21 Kiggen-Martin 197:19 **Kilsheimer** 3:5 6:22,25 kind 15:19 17:22 82:7 84:22 86:7 87:3 111:13 117:18 133:22 167:5 172:3 173:4 174:20 181:21 212:17 212:22 223:11 263:12 kinds 17:3 18:4 25:5 27:3 51:23 158:4

Filed 04/21/2009

knew 39:4 82:14 83:18 209:2 271:19 know 7:21 9:2,20 10:23 11:15 14:3,5,8,23 15:2,3 16:9,16 17:21 17:24 18:15 22:11 24:16 25:20 26:2 29:7 30:8 32:12 38:7 41:12,15 42:3 43:13 43:13 44:22 47:22 48:20,25 49:22 54:6 54:16 55:4,5 58:7 59:24 60:23 61:17,22

65:5 66:5,7 69:7,15 69:25 70:9,10,11,12 70:18 74:9,14 77:18 80:23 81:24 82:3,6,11 83:5 84:10,22 86:4 87:19 88:12 98:7 99:3 108:15 109:13 112:24 114:20 115:20 116:14 118:9.13 121:5,14,18,19 125:8 129:14 130:10 132:4 134:12,22,25 137:13 141:4,12,16 143:20 143:22,25 144:24 149:15,20 150:14 155:7 156:6 158:2,6 158:14 159:4,7 160:18 161:3,5 164:5 164:9 165:22,24 166:9,9,14,14,16,17 166:21 168:16 169:7 169:11 172:4 178:8 184:4,13 185:12,15 193:19 194:3 195:18 197:9 198:19 199:22 200:9 201:10,22 205:7,21 207:8,11 209:7,14 213:24 217:13 218:23 224:2 224:15 226:22 228:23 229:4 233:5.10 234:18 235:3 237:12 241:10 242:24,25,25 243:15,18 244:14,17 247:25 248:4,7 249:9 251:23 256:23,25 257:7,10,13,25 260:16 261:10,11,19 262:22 263:17,19 266:6,13,19,22,25 269:23 271:19,25 272:8 274:5,17 275:3 275:9,16 277:14,15 278:12 279:8 287:25 288:3,17 289:2 292:22,24 293:22 294:12,17 297:21 299:13 knowable 47:16 93:5,7 94:20 293:21

94:20 293:21 **knowing** 45:15 261:14 **knowledge** 16:23 17:2 25:24 26:20 46:20 49:10 103:5 135:4 141:7 242:13 258:8

knowledgeable 15:22 44:16 51:21 52:7 158:3 163:25 167:23

283:5